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## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

The second edition has been revised throughout. I have been convinced by the arguments of several reviewers that my view of the difficult passage in 44 в requires modification, and I have modified it accordingly. In one or two other passages I have expressed myself (I hope) more clearly: otherwise there is no change.

I desire to thank the reviewers in England and in Germany for their courreous and considerate reception of this little work.

Emmanuel Collegf, Cambridge, February 21, 1891.

## PREFACE.

No apology is needed for a new edition of the Crito. The only edition in English which possesses more than a purely ephemeral value is Dyer's reproduction of Cron (Boston, 1885). And to my mind the Crito is one of the finest of Plato's minor dialogues, breathing the most exalted morality, full of the deepest historical interest, and above all (as I think I have shewn in my Introduction) perfect as a work of art. As in the Apology, so here, I have followed on the whole the readings of the Bodieian. But I am as far as possible from wishing to disparage the second family of manuscripts, and it will be seen from my critical appendix that I have not infrequently preferred a reading traceable to it.

The editors to whom I am most indebted in the formation of the text are Schanz and Kral: for the interpretation I have found Cron's edition far the most valuable. I have also consulted the editions by Wohlrab and Göbel, and other critical contributions to the study of the dialogue referred to in my notes. But I have frequently
ventured to differ from the other editors in the interpretation of the dialogue : and a large part of the commentary is my own.

I have again gratefully to acknowledge my obligations to Mr Neil.

Emmanuel College,
November 25, 1887.

## INTRODUCTION.

The Crito is one of the Socratic tetralogy of dialogues, embracing the Euthyphro, the Apology, the Crito and the Phaedo. The justification for grouping these together is that each of them is concerned with the circumstances of Socrates' trial, imprisonment and death. At the outset of the Euthyphro, we are favoured with a description of Socrates' accuser, together with a brief account of the indictment: while in the rest of the dialogue Plato proceeds to refute by anticipation the charge of impiety, shewing how infinitely more reverent is the scepticism of Socrates than the unreflecting orthodoxy of which Euthyphro is the exponent. The Apology was intended by Plato to be a triumphant vindication of the whole faith and practice of his master in society, religion and politics. In the Crito and the Phaedo we are brought face to face with issues which are at once narrower and wider: narrower, inasmuch as they deal with one particular aspect of Socrates' personality, the Crito with his political, the Phaedo with his eschatological views, freely developed and expanded by Plato: wider, because in both we are introduced to problems of more universal interest, in the Crito to the relation between the individual and the State, in the Phaedo to the inımortality of the soul.

If we regard the Euthyphro as a kind of prologue to the great trilogy of which Socrates is the central figure, we shall see in the Crito as it were the second drama, related to the first and last much as the Choephori is related to the Agamemnon and the Eumenides. From one point of view, indeed, there might seem to be a closer connection between the Crito and the Phaedo than between it and the Apology: for while in the first member of the trilogy we have Socrates' Apologia pro vita sua, the other two set before us his Apologia pro morte sua: in the Crito we have the citizen's justification for remaining to die, in the Phaedo the philosopher's, the hope of immortality. But on a closer examination we shall see that our dialogue is rather an epilogue to the Apology than a prologue to the Phaedo. There is little in the doctrine of the two first dialogues that travels beyond the standpoint of the historical Socrates, whereas in the purely philosophical sections of the Phaedo, Socrates speaks for Plato rather than for himself. And in the second place, we are introduced in the Crito to an elaborate refutation of the political prejudice against Socrates which lent such fatal force to the indictment ${ }^{1}$, a prejudice touched upon, it is true, in the Apology ${ }^{2}$, but for the first time thoroughly exposed and rebutted in our dialogue. So far from being the enemy of his country and the corrupter of his fellow-citizens, the Crito sets before us Socrates as the only true patriot, faithful to his country and her laws even at a moment when average Athenian morality as interpreted by the mouth of Crito pronounced it to be not only ex-

[^0]cusable but his imperative duty to break the laws and save his life ${ }^{1}$. The structure of the dialogue is admirably adapted for the purpose of exhibiting the patriotism of Socrates, and reveals throughout a close analogy to the actual circumstances of Socrates' trial, defence and condemnation. As the correct apprehension of this analogy will bring still more clearly into view the real scope and meaning of the Crito, I will endeavour to trace it in detail: the subject-matter of our dialogue will be considered later.

In the trial of Socrates, there were three parties concerned-the prosecution, represented by Meletus and his associates, Socrates himself as the defendant, and the judges. The charge was virtually one of High Treason: Socrates, it was alleged, had been unfaithful to his country by endeavouring to demoralise her youth and refusing to recognise her gods. A verdict of guilty was returned and Socrates condemned to death: this much the Apology gives us. In the Crito, as it appears to me, the semblance of a trial is still preserved, under the mask of dialogue. This time Socrates is judge, Crito prosecutor, the State prisoner at the bar. The charge is wrong-doing (ádıк $\hat{\imath} v$ ): the verdict one of acquittal. I see frequent indications of such a juridical structure throughout the Crito, such as the personification of the Laws, the use of $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \lambda \lambda$ र́vą vórovs as a figurative expression for breaking the laws ( $50 \mathrm{~A}, 50 \mathrm{D}, 51 \mathrm{~A}, 54 \mathrm{C}$ ), perhaps also the use of $\epsilon i \sigma \eta \gamma \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta$ at in 48 a (ov̉к $\dot{\rho} \rho \theta \hat{\omega}$ с $\epsilon i \sigma \eta \gamma \in \hat{\epsilon}$,

 $\pi i \omega v)$, and in particular the words of Socrates in 50 B ,
just after the Laws have been brought upon the stage:

 $\pi \rho о \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota$ кvрías єival ${ }^{1}$. The framework upon which the Crito hangs is hidden throughout the two opening chapters by the dramatic setting of the dialogue, nor does it emerge into view for some time, owing to the peculiar form which Crito's speech against the State of necessity assumed: partly for artistic reasons, and partly no doubt in order to conform to historical truth, Plato felt bound to make Crito arraign the State indirectly rather than directly-by means of earnest entreaties addressed to Socrates urging him to effect an illegal escape. It is not till we reach the sixth Chapter, in which Socrates begins to expound and emphasize the principle upon which the verdict ought to hinge, that the essentially legal structure of the dialogue first comes clearly before our eyes. Socrates the judge lays down the higher and unwritten law by which the State is to be judged: ovँтє ${ }^{\alpha} \rho a$

 heard in her own defence: she pleads that her very existence is endangered (xi), that Socrates above all Athenians owes her even more than filial obedience and regard (xiii-xiv), finally, after a brief reply to the arguments of Crito (xv), she concludes by holding out to Socrates a prospect of rewards in the
${ }^{1}$ Cron's remark on this passage is true, but not (I think) the whole truth: "Dabei wird man an die Sitte zu Athen erinnert, dass, wenn es sich um Abschaffung eines Gesetzes handelte, dieses durch erwählte Anwälte (ovvク่ opoc) vertheidigt wurde.'
other world, at the same time reiterating her own
 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ víò $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \dot{\sigma} \pi \omega \nu(54$ B). Socrates then pronounces



Enough has now been said to establish what is I think a clear analogy between the structure of our dialogue and the circumstances of Socrates' trial: but in order to obtain an accurate comprehension of the meaning of the verdict delivered by Socrates, it is necessary to inquire somewhat more particularly into the position assigned to Crito and to the Laws. Crito is not merely the friend of Socrates, pleading with passionate earnestness against the sacrifice of the associate whom he held so dear: he is also the mouthpiece of Athenian public opinion. This is clearly implied in the arguments by which he endeavours to induce Socrates to make his escape: "many men," he says in 44 B, "who do not know you and me well, will think me guilty of neglect, because I might have saved you, if I had been willing to spend money": and again in 45 E , "I for my part feel ashamed for you and for us who are your friends. It will be thought that the whole of this thing which has befallen you is due to our cowardice, I mean your appearance in court when you need not have appeared, the process itself, and last of all, the crowning absurdity of the whole transaction, that you should be thought to have given us the slip through a sort of cowardice and unmanliness upon our part, because we did not save you and you did not save yourself, when it was possible and practicable for you to do so, if we had been good for anything at all." Had Socrates complied with the invitation of his
friend, not only would no Athenian have condemned him, but to the mass of his countrymen his conduct would have appeared not only natural, but perfectly just: the ties of friendship were stronger in their estimation than those of patriotism. Speaking of the reproaches which he would have to endure for leaving Socrates to die, Crito asks in 44 C: "what character could be more dishonourable than the character of preferring one's money to one's friends? The people will never believe that it was you who refused to escape, and we who were anxious to save you." The concluding part of Crito's appeal is even more emphatic: "And besides, Socrates, I think you are trying to do what is zurong, betraying yourself, when you might be saved ( 45 C )." Crito is throughout the representative of average Athenian morality, and from the fact that he nowhere recognises the paramount duty which both Socrates and he as surety for his friend owed to the State, we can see how lightly the yoke of patriotism pressed upon an age that produced a Theramenes and an Alcibiades.

Let us now examine the part played by the Laws in the dialogue. It is easy to go wrong here: for that which is acquitted by Socrates is not the verdict or sentence which the unjust judges had pronounced against him: Socrates indeed declares again and again throughout the dialogue that his condemnation was flagrantly unjust. Nor yet is it strictly speaking the constitution of Athens in particular, for Socrates was far from viewing democracy with an altogether favourable eye: but what really stands arraigned before him is the State in the abstract as opposed to the Indivi-dual-in other words the principle that alone renders
possible the existence of any kind of State, aristocracy no less than democracy, the vó $\mu$ os ös $\pi \rho o \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \tau \tau$ às


We are now in a position to comprehend the full meaning of Socrates' decision. His acquittal of the State is at once a condemnation of his judges and a counter-accusation of High Treason against the people themselves. For if the State was innocent, the guilt rested with the judges, who had misinterpreted the law : and the postponement of public interests to the apparent advantage of the individual, which forms the very pith and marrow of Crito's appeal, is shewn to be just as treasonable as Socrates himself was patriotic.

Up to this point we have been concerned chiefly with the form of the dialogue: it remains to consider the doctrine. We shall find that both in respect of ethical and political teaching the Crito remains true to the creed of the historical Socrates. This is exactly what we should expect beforehand, if the real purpose of Plato, as I have endeavoured to shew, was to hurl back the charge of High Treason from the Socrates of history upon the Athenians at large.

We note first of all the peculiarly Socratic method which is employed throughout the inquiry. The entire dialogue is but an illustration of the precept which is


 the $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s$ is $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon v i ̀ \tau \rho o ́ \pi \varphi$ ádıкךтє́ov єival: it forms so to speak the major premise of Socrates' practical syllogism, of which the minor is established by the plead-

[^1]ing of the Laws ( 50 A foll.). The historical accuracy of our dialogue is apparent in its ethical doctrine no less than in its method. We seem to hear the voice of Socrates when we read that only the wise man's judgment is deserving of regard ( 47 A ), and still more when we find this statement backed up by the familiar illustrations from the arts ( 47 B foll.): nor is the conception of wickedness as a disease of the soul, and the preference of soul over body ( 47 E foll.), out of harmony with Socrates' teaching. Equally Socratic is
 $\alpha \hat{\alpha} \lambda \grave{\alpha} \tau o ̀ ~ \epsilon \hat{v} \zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$ : and the refusal in 49 E to permit any divergence between theory and practice is only the
 also that Socrates would have willingly accepted the

 himself. The objections raised by Zeller and many editors, on the ground of passages in Xenophon and Aristotle ${ }^{1}$, seem to be directed rather against the apparent altruism of such a doctrine than at the doctrine itself. But in the mouth of Socrates the sentiment, so far from being altruistic, was dictated by conscious egoism. He refrained from doing wrong, not out of regard for others, but because of its effect upon his own soul: for just in proportion as the value of our

[^2]souls exceeds that of our bodies ${ }^{1}$, is the supreme importance of keeping them healthy and free from stain, if we would consult our own individual interests. Rightly understood, this thorough-going vindication of virtuous conduct even under the extremest provocation is altogether in harmony with a creed which regarded soul as the true self, and self-knowledge and self-development as the end of life.

The political teaching of the Crito faithfully represents the opinions held by Socrates and establishes his right to the title of patriot, in contrast to his fellowcountrymen. Whether we regard the decision itself, or the grounds by which it is enforced, the whole political bearing of the dialogue may be summed up in the words which Xenophon puts into the mouth of
 IV. 4. 12). To break the laws is to strike at the root of all society ( 50 A ): it is not merely a breach of contract ( 5 I E), it is State-murder, a crime worse than matricide ( $50 \mathrm{~B}, 5 \mathrm{I}$ A foll.), because our country is far more to us than a mother. What an emphatic assertion of the old Greek theory of life is here! The very man whose daily work it was to preach self-study and sclf-knowledge proclaims that we should live for the State rather than for ourselves. Nor if we view the question rightly is there any contradiction. Socrates refused to separate the ßios $\pi р а к \tau \kappa o$ ós from the Bios $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \eta \tau \iota \kappa o ́ s$; he claimed to be a political as well as a moral reformer: oî $\mu \alpha \iota \mu \in \tau^{\prime}$ ỏ $\lambda i ́ \gamma \omega \nu$ ' $A \theta \eta v a i \omega \nu$, he says


[^3] $v \hat{v} v(52 \mathrm{IE})$. He exhorted the Athenians $\dot{\alpha} \phi^{\prime}$ é $\sigma \tau i ́ a s$ ü $\rho \chi \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ ка $\theta a i ́ \rho \epsilon \iota v \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu$-to reform the State by reforming themselves: and, conversely, he believed that the full development of the individual could only be attained in the service of the State. The only possible life as it appeared to Socrates was the life of a citizen. He condemned the increasing divergence between public and private interests in his day, and traced to this among other causes the decline of Athenian prosperity (Mem. III. 5. 21).

It may appear strange that a man so prone to doubt and inquiry should have hesitated to call in question the authority of the laws: but the fact is undeniable. Socrates would have agreed with the remark of Cleon in Thucydides (III. 37.4) oi $\mu \grave{v} v \gamma^{\grave{\alpha} \rho}$

 whole life was distinguished by absolute fidelity to the laws of his country : he had upheld them against the fury of the people and the tyranny of the thirty: and now he consents to death rather than break them. It was for their strict subordination to law and authority that Socrates entertained so warm an admiration for Sparta and Crete: and the same feeling underlies the praise which he bestows in Xenophon upon the Athens of the past (Mem. III. 5). The generation before his birth appeared to him a kind of golden age, when the State flourished and the citizens were happy under the old unreflecting morality, where no right was known but that of law. The limitation of Socrates' genius appears here. Had he carried out his principles to their fullest logical
development, he would not have shrunk from submitting to the test of his dialectic the whole question of the validity and authority of law; as a condition of the stability of social life : but to him it is almost an axiom that the law should be obeyed. The fact is that Socrates' rationalism was only half-complete. If reason presided over one hemisphere, $\mu а \nu \tau \kappa \kappa \prime$ appeared to him to rule the other ${ }^{1}$. It was reserved for Plato to dethrone $\mu a v \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ and make vov̂s the sole monarch of the world ${ }^{3}$. But in Socrates' way of thinking, the Laws derive their validity from God, and have no need of human reason to establish it: they are of the same family with the Laws in the Unseen World, and he who offends against the one





The Crito therefore presents us with what is upon the whole a faithful picture of Socrates both as a man and as a teacher. Only in two respects does it appear to travel beyond the views which may with certainty be ascribed to him. While still in the vigour of life and possessed with the ardour of his mission, Socrates on no occasion expressed himself so despairingly about his country as we should infer
${ }^{1}$ See this admirably.worked out in Nohle's " Die Statslehre Platos in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung" (Jena, 1880), pp. 10-13.
${ }^{2}$ In Politicus 209 C priests and soothsayers are placed on the same level with slaves, artisans and merchants.
${ }^{3}$ See also Xen. Mem. Iv. 4. 25 каì toîs $\theta$ goîs ápa, $\hat{\omega}$

from various passages in the Crito ${ }^{1}$ : on the contrary he thought the reformation of Athens quite within the range of practical politics (Xen. Mem. III. 5). Nor would he have spoken of a future life so confidently as the Laws with his approval speak towards the close of the dialogue. But even here we must allow something for the influence which the imminent prospect of death might exert even upon the ardent spirit and sternly logical mind of a Socrates. On the whole I think it probable that his unjust condemnation may have led him to despair, not so much of Athens, as of the Athenians: but I cannot bring myself to believe that he could ever have dogmatically asserted or approved of the doctrine of immortality. Plato seems to be responsible for that.

In conclusion, let us endeavour to sum up the reasons which induced Socrates to remain and die. First and foremost, we may put the influence of his 'divine sign.' Although this is nowhere expressly mentioned in the Crito, yet there seems to be an allusion to it in the words with which the dialogue
 $\gamma \epsilon i$ ital. The very pleading of the Laws is but the voice of the divine sign made articulate : see my note

 rejection too of Crito's offer was the best possible refutation of the charge of treason, as it revealed Socrates in the light of a true patriot in the midst

[^4]of men, with whom private and personal interests weighed more than regard for their country and her laws. Nor must we forget, in the third place, that Socrates was now old, and had finished his mission: it was hardly possible to find a more opportune moment for dying. Had he been thirty and not seventy, I doubt if we should admire him so much: I think we should have thought him lacking in spirit. Plato in his place would probably have escaped, and I for one should not have blamed him. As it was, the death of Socrates was the best thing that could happen for his fame and influence: it was well worth while to die, if only for the sake of the impulse which his death imparted to the greatest of his pupils.

## $K P I T \Omega N$.

[Ar пері̀ практє́oү. H̉өાкóc.]

## TA TOY $\triangle 1 A \Lambda O T O Y ~ \Pi P O \Sigma \Omega \Pi A$

## $\Sigma \Omega$ KPATH $\Sigma, K P I T \Omega N$.

St. I.



KP. Пávv $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ oỉv.
$\Sigma \Omega$. Пŋขı́ка $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a ;$

Crito visits Socrates in prison. 'Today, Socrates, the ship will return from Delos, and to-morrow, you must 5
 die., тои̂ $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \omega \tau \eta \rho i o v ~ ф u ́ \lambda a \xi ̆ ~ ن ́ \pi а к о и ิ \sigma a \iota . ~$

 єं $\mu$ о̂.


 $\sigma \iota \eta \hat{\eta} \pi а \rho а \kappa а ́ \theta \eta \sigma a \iota$;






 av̉тท̀̀ каі̀ тра́шऽ фє́рєєऽ.
 $\nu а \kappa \tau \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ \tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa о и ̂ \tau о \nu ~ o ̋ \nu \tau a, ~ \epsilon i ̉ ~ \delta \epsilon i ̂ ~ \eta ้ \delta \eta ~ \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \tau \hat{\imath} \nu$.


 тยา!.
 зо $\dot{a} \phi \hat{\jmath} \xi a \iota$;











II. $\Sigma \Omega$. ' $A \lambda \lambda$ ', $\omega^{B} \mathrm{~K} \rho i \not \tau \omega \nu, \tau \cup ̛ \chi \eta ~ a ̀ \gamma a \theta \hat{\eta}$. $\epsilon i$

[^5] таи́тŋ тoîs $\theta \epsilon o i ̂ s ~ ф i ̀ \lambda o v, ~ \tau а v ́ т \eta ~ \epsilon ै \sigma \tau \omega . ~ o v ̉ ~$ $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu \tau o \iota ~ o i ̂ \mu a \iota ~ \eta ̋ \xi \in \iota \nu$ aùтò $\tau \eta \dot{\eta \epsilon \rho o \nu . ~}$

КР. | Пó $\theta \epsilon \nu$ тои̂то тєкцаїрєь; 44
$\Sigma \Omega$. 'Еү由' $\sigma o \iota ~ \epsilon ่ \rho \hat{\omega}$. т $\hat{y}$ रáp $\pi о \nu$





 $\mu \epsilon$.

KP. ${ }^{9} \mathrm{H} \nu$ סè $\delta \grave{\eta} \tau i ́ \tau o ̀ ~ \epsilon ́ v v ́ \pi \nu \nu o \nu ; ~$


 є́ $\rho i \beta \omega \lambda о \nu$ їкоьо.

 K $\rho i \tau \omega \nu$.


 ' $\mu i a ~ \xi \nu \mu ф о \rho a ~ \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu, a \lambda \lambda a \quad \chi \omega \rho i \varsigma \mu \in \nu \quad \sigma \circ v$










 $\pi \rho u ̂ \chi \theta a \iota, \omega ゙ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \dot{a} \nu \pi \rho a \chi \theta \hat{\eta}$.












Your friendsare willing to run the risk of saving you; indeed the risk is but small.
5










 ä入入a $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda a ́$.
 $15 \pi 0 \lambda v ̀ ~ \tau a ̉ \rho \gamma u ́ p ı o ́ v ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau \iota \nu, ~ o ̀ ~ \theta e ́ \lambda o v \sigma \iota ~ \lambda a ß o ́ v \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \tau \iota \nu e ̀ s ~$














 $\tau \omega \hat{\nu} \kappa a \tau a ̀$ Єєтта入íà.



 бov $\sigma \pi \epsilon \epsilon \cup ́ \sigma a \iota \in ́ \nu ~ \tau \epsilon ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \epsilon ै \sigma \pi \epsilon ย \sigma a \nu ~ \sigma \epsilon ̀ ~ \delta \iota a-~$ $\phi \theta \in i ̂ \rho a \iota \beta o v \lambda o ́ \mu \in \nu \circ$. тро̀s $\delta$ è тои́тоьs каì тov̀s viєîs тoùs баvтои̂ eै $\mu о \iota \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ ठокєîs $\pi \rho о$ -

Besides it is wrong, even cowardly, to die when you might live. Think of your children and your 5 friends: we shall be branded as cowards for our share in this whule matter.'






















 $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \hat{a} \chi \theta a \iota$. $\epsilon i \delta^{\prime}$ є̈ $\tau \iota \quad \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \mu \epsilon \nu о \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu$, ả $\delta \dot{v} \nu а т о \nu$ каì
 $\pi \epsilon i$ Өоv $\mu$ оє каі̀ $\mu \eta \delta а \mu \omega \hat{s}$ ü $\lambda \lambda \omega s$ тоієє.
VI. $\Sigma \Omega$. ${ }^{s} \Omega$ фì $\epsilon \mathrm{K} \rho i \tau \omega \nu$, $\dot{\eta} \pi \rho o \theta \nu \mu i a \quad \sigma o v \mathrm{~B}$
> ${ }^{6}$ Crito, the only opinions worth regarding are those of the wise. Is it not so ?" 5




























 $\pi a ́ \sigma a s ~ \chi \rho \eta ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ \delta o ́ \xi a s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \grave{a} \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \omega \nu \quad \tau \iota \mu \hat{a} \nu, a ̉ \lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ 35$
 $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma є \tau a \iota$;

KP. Kà $\omega$ ¢.
 $\nu \eta \rho a ̀ s ~ \mu \eta$;

KP. Nai.
$\Sigma \Omega$. $\mathrm{X} \rho \eta \sigma \tau a i$ ©̀̀ oí $\chi$ ai $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \phi \rho o \nu i ́ \mu \omega \nu$, $\pi o \nu \eta \rho a i ̀$ ठè $a i$ i $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \phi \rho o ́ v \omega \nu$;

KP. П $\omega$ s $\delta$ ' ov";
 в $\gamma \cup \mu \nu a \zeta_{o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu}^{\prime} о$ à $\nu \grave{\eta} \rho$ каі̀ тои̂то $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \omega \nu$ $\pi о ́ т \epsilon \rho о \nu \pi a \nu \tau o ̀ s ~ a ̀ \nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ є ̇ \pi a i ̀ ш ~ к а і ~ \psi о ́ \gamma \omega$



KP. 'Evìs uóvov.
$\Sigma \Omega$. Ойкии̂̀ фоßєîvөaı хрウ̀ тоùs
'As in gymnastics, so in questions of right and wrong: we should regard, not the opinions of the many, but only his who knows. Otherwise that within us which is concerned with
 will be destroyed:
 то $\pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$.

KP. $\Delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a \delta \dot{\eta}$.


 ${ }_{15}$ ä̀ $\lambda \lambda о \iota$.

KP. "E $\sigma \tau \iota \tau a \hat{\tau} \tau$.


 20 како̀v $\pi \epsilon$ є́ $\sigma є \tau а \iota$;

KP. Пิ̂s $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ov*;
 каì єis тí т $\hat{\nu} \nu \tau o \hat{v} a \pi \epsilon \iota \theta o \hat{v} \nu \tau o s ;$

KP. $\Delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o \nu$ öтı єis тò $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \cdot$ тои̂тo $\gamma \grave{\rho} \rho$ סเó $\lambda \lambda v \sigma \iota$.











VIII. $\Sigma \Omega$. Фє́ $\rho \in \delta_{\eta}^{\prime}, ~ \epsilon \in a ̀ \nu ~ \tau o ̀ ~ v i \pi o ̀ ~ \tau o ̂ ̂ ~ v i \gamma \iota \epsilon \iota \nu o ̂ ̂ ~$
 then be intolera-
bie. It is true, $\delta o v s ~$
à
$\epsilon$
$\delta \iota a \phi \theta \epsilon \iota \rho o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu$
$\delta \iota o \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \pi \epsilon \iota-$

 us to death: but
life is not to be


KP. Naí.
 каі $\delta \iota є \phi \theta a \rho \mu$ е́vov $\sigma \omega ́ \mu$ атоя;

KP. Ở $\delta a \mu \omega ิ \varsigma$.
Io






KP. O $\dot{\delta} \delta a \mu \omega ิ s$.
$\Sigma \Omega$. 'А $А \lambda \lambda a ̀ \tau \iota \mu \iota \dot{\tau} \tau \rho \rho \nu$;
KP. Пoдv́ $\gamma є$.








B KP. $\Delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a \delta \grave{\eta} \kappa a i ̀ ~ \tau a v ̂ \tau a \cdot ~ \phi a i ́ \eta ~ \gamma \grave{a} \rho ~ a ̆ \nu, ~ \omega ̉ ~ \Sigma ~ \omega ́ ~-~$ кратєs.



 ả $\lambda \lambda a ̀ \tau o ̀ ~ \epsilon v ̉ ~ \zeta ั \eta \nu . ~$

KP. 'А $A \lambda a ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \nu є \iota . ~$
A. C.
 є̇ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu, \mu$ évєı خ̀ oư $\mu \in ́ \nu \in \iota$;

KP. Mévєє.


This is the question we have to ask-is it right or is it wrong for me to make my 5 escape? With the consequences to you or to my children or myself, we are not concerned.
 $\pi \in \iota \rho a ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota \quad$ é $\xi \iota \in ́ v a \iota ~ \mu \eta े ~ a ̉ \phi \iota e ́ v \tau \omega \nu ~ ' A ~ \theta \eta-C ~$ $\nu a i ́ \omega \nu, \hat{\eta}$ ov̉ Síкаьo้ каì є่à̀ $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ фаí$\nu \eta \tau a \iota$ ठíкаьоע, $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$, $\epsilon \grave{i} \delta \grave{\epsilon} \mu \eta$, , є่ $\omega \mu \epsilon \nu$. às $\delta \grave{~} \sigma \dot{v} \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \varsigma \tau a ̀ \varsigma ~ \sigma \kappa \epsilon ́ \psi \epsilon \iota \varsigma \pi \epsilon \rho i ́ \tau \epsilon \grave{a} \nu a-$ $\lambda \omega ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ रр $\mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu \kappa a i ̀ ~ \delta o ́ \xi \eta s ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \pi a i ́ \delta \omega \nu$












 "opa סè $\tau$ ' $\delta \rho \omega \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$.







 oịn.

KP. 'А $\lambda \lambda a ̀$ тєє $\quad$ á $\sigma о \mu a \iota$.











Do you still believe that we ought never to do wrong or evil to another, or requite wrong with wrong, or evil 5 with evil? Think well before you answer: the adherents of this view cannot arguc with the many, who think otherwise.' 'I still believe it.'


 $\pi \rho а о ́ т є \rho a$, ${ }^{\circ} \mu \omega \varsigma$ то́ $\gamma є$ ảठıкєî̀ т $\hat{\varphi}$ ádıкойдть каї како̀


KP. Фанє́v.

KP. Oỉ $\delta \hat{\eta} \tau a$.
 $\pi о \lambda \lambda o i ̀ ~ o i ้ o \nu \tau a \iota, ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi \epsilon \iota \delta ウ ́ ~ \gamma \epsilon ~ o v ̉ \delta a \mu \omega ̂ s ~ \delta \epsilon i ̂ ~ a ̀ \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon i ̂ \nu . ~$
C KP. Ovi фаivetal.





KP. Ov̇ $\delta a \mu \omega ̂ \varsigma$.



$$
3-2
$$

KP. 'А $\lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \lambda$ '́ $\gamma \epsilon \iota \varsigma$.














 $45 \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ тои̂то äкоขє.
 $\lambda \epsilon \in \epsilon$.
$\Sigma \Omega$. $\Lambda$ '́ $\gamma \omega$ $\delta \grave{\eta}$ av̉ тò $\mu \epsilon \tau a ̀$ tov̂to, $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \delta^{\prime}$



KP. Поьттє́ò.
XI. $\Sigma \Omega$. 'Ек тои́т $\omega \nu$ ס̀̀ ä $\theta \rho \epsilon \iota$. ảтเóvтєs є่ $\nu-$

















XII. $\Sigma \Omega$. Tî ov̉v, à $\nu$ єitm



之ळ́кратєऽ, $\mu \dot{\eta}$ Өav́ $\mu a \zeta_{\epsilon} \tau \dot{a} \lambda \in \gamma^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu a, d \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$
 should obey us without any qualification, as our 5 child and slave. Persuasion you might bring to bear upon us, but





 $\sigma เ \nu$;' ov̉ $\mu \epsilon ́ \mu \phi о \mu a \imath, ~ \phi a i ́ \eta \nu ~ a ̈ \nu$. 'ả $\lambda \lambda a ̀$ тoîs $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau \eta े \nu$







































KР. "Е $\mu \circ \iota \gamma \epsilon$ бокє $\hat{\text {. }}$
XIII. $\Sigma \Omega$. ' $\Sigma \kappa о ́ \pi \epsilon \iota ~ \tau о i ́ \nu v \nu, ~ \omega ீ ~ \Sigma$ ผ́кратєs,' фаîє $\grave{a} \nu$ '̉ $\sigma \omega$ s oi vó $\mu o \iota$, ' $\epsilon i \mathfrak{i} \dot{\eta} \mu \in i ̂ s ~ \tau a v ̂ \tau a ~ d ̉ \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta}$

 $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \eta^{\sigma} \sigma \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma, \epsilon \in \kappa \theta \rho \epsilon ́ \psi a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma, \pi a \iota \delta \epsilon \dot{\prime} \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$,

To remain in Athens is a tacit promise to obey us : disobedience would be unfilial, ungrateful and 5 dishonest.




















 ס́́тєрa тоьєर̂.


In your case, Socrates, the bargain is particularly binding: no one has lived more constantly in A-
5 thens than you. Even during the trial you might have chosen exile rather than death.
 $\nu o \in i ̂ s, ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ o v ̉ \chi ~ \eta ̈ \kappa \iota \sigma \tau a ' A \theta \eta \nu a i \omega \nu ~ \sigma \epsilon ́, ~ a ̉ \lambda \lambda '$









 $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \xi \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \varsigma$, ov้тє ä $\lambda \lambda о \sigma \epsilon$ ov̉ $\delta a \mu o ́ \sigma \epsilon, \epsilon i \quad \mu \eta \prime$ тоь $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \epsilon v-$



















 $\hat{\eta}$ ó $\mu о \lambda о \gamma \omega \hat{\omega} \mu \nu$;










 $\tau є \kappa a i ̀ ~ \tau v \phi \lambda o i ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ o i ́ ~ a ̈ \lambda \lambda о \iota ~ a ̀ \nu a ́ \pi \eta \rho o \iota ~ o u ̛ \tau \omega ~ \sigma o \iota ~ \delta \iota a-~$ $\phi \in \rho o ́ v \tau \omega \varsigma \tau \omega ิ \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ 'A $\theta \eta \nu a i \omega \nu$ クैр $\epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu$ र̀ $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota \varsigma ~ \tau \epsilon$




 $\mu a \rho \tau \alpha ́ \nu \omega \nu$ тı тоúт $\omega \nu$ тí ảyaӨòv є̇ $\rho \gamma a ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota$






By making your escape, you will endanger your friends. And whither will you flee? Wherever 5 you go, suspicion and ridicule await you. Your children too will suf-
 escape than by your death.







 $\tau \alpha ́ s ~ \tau \epsilon ~ \epsilon \dot{v} \nu о \mu о \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu a s ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \varsigma ~ \kappa a i ̀ ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ a ̀ \nu \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \tau o v ̀ s$

































 боîs трофє̂̂бь $\mu \eta \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \pi a i ̂ \delta a s ~ \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \pi \lambda \epsilon$ єiovos $\pi о \circ o \hat{v} \mu \eta ं \tau \epsilon \tau$ ò $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ ä $\lambda \lambda о \mu \eta \delta \epsilon ̀ \nu \quad \pi \rho o ̀$



It is well for you to die now, in view both of this present world and of the next. Do not let Crito per- 5
 suade you."














 what 1 seem to
hiearthem saying. $\tau \iota \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$
aủ $\lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$
$\delta o \kappa o \hat{v} \sigma \iota \nu$
$\alpha<\kappa o v ่ \epsilon \iota \nu, \kappa a i$

Have you anything more to urge?' 'No.

5 thing.' 'Then
let us act as God directs.'









## NOTES.

 dialogue generally has two or even three titles: the Bodleian ms for example denotes the other three members of the first Tetralogy by

 these titles dates from Plato, who generally (but not always) named the dialogue after one of the characters appearing in it. The second title was added by Thrasylus, a rhetorician and literary critic who flourished about the Christian era: it is intended to explain the subject treated of in the dialogue. It is not clear whether the third title was added, as Grote believes (Plato Vol. I. p. I60), by Thrasylus, or by Diogenes Laertius either on his own responsibility or in obedience to some other authority (see Diog. Laert. III. 49) ; at all events it is meant to indicate the formal scope of the dialogue -whether a dialogue of exposition ( $\dot{u} \phi \eta \gamma \eta \tau \iota \kappa \delta{ }^{s}$, of which $\dot{\eta} \theta$ ukós is a subdivision), or a dialogue of search ( $\varsigma \eta \tau \eta \tau \iota \kappa \delta s$ ). Here the Crito is correctly described as an ethical dialogue dealing with a question
 трактє́ov єíre $\mu \mathfrak{\eta}$ )-viz. is it right to save one's life by breaking the law?

Crito was one of Socrates' oldest and most attached friends (Apol. 33 D, Phaedo $1 I_{5}$ A foll.). He appears to have been rich and not indisposed to make more money (Euthyd. 304 C ). The fact that he had stood surety for Socrates after the trial (Phaedo 115 D ) increased his personal danger if Socrates should escape from prison, and reveals in a yet stronger light his devotion to his friend: see note cn 45 D. "Plato's picture of Crito is as of a sensible and kindly man of the world, looking upon life from the point of view of an honest Athenian gentleman, but without any capacity for philo-sophy".-Archer-Hind's Phaedo p. 42.

The scene is in the prison, just before daybreak.

## CHAPTER I.

Crito warns Socrates that the ship is on its way back from Delos, and will arrive to-day.
43 A I. $\tau \eta \nu \kappa \alpha \delta_{\epsilon}=$ ' at this hour') ( $\tau \eta \nu i к \alpha$ 'at that hour': so $\tau о \iota o ́ \sigma \delta \epsilon$ $=$ ' of this sort' )( roios ' of that sort'. The distinction is like that between $\delta \delta \delta$ and oûros. $\tau \eta \nu i \kappa a$ seems to have been originally a Doric adverb ( $\tau \hat{\eta} \nu$ os is Doric for $\epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu o s$ ): the suffix reappears in aúr-íкa.
2. $\pi \rho \dot{\omega}$. Socrates is not surprised to see Crito, for we learn from the Phaedo (59D, cf. Xen. Mem. IV. 8. 2) that he was daily visited by his friends during the interval between his condemnation and his death: but he is surprised to see him so early. The prison was
 $\pi \rho \omega$ and not $\pi \rho \omega t$ is the correct Attic form of this word. The Bodleian has $\pi \rho \omega$ l.
3. $\pi \alpha ́ v v ~ \mu \grave{v} v ~ o u ̋ v=' i m o$, valde quidem' (Göbel). $\mu \grave{e ̀ v ~ o u ̂ v ~ i s ~ c o r-~}$ rective: see on Apol. 26 в and cf. infra 44 B $\alpha \not \tau o \pi o \nu ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \epsilon ̀ \nu u ́ \pi \nu ı o \nu, ~ \hat{\omega}$

4. $\pi \eta \nu i к \alpha \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha . \pi \eta \nu i к \alpha$ means 'at what precise time?' $\pi o ́ \tau \epsilon$ only 'at what time?' $\mu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ makes the question more vague: 'About what o'clock is it?' So $\tau \ell \mu \alpha \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$; = quid potissimum? Gorg. $44^{8}$ D.

 is the morning twilight, and $\beta a \theta$ ís implies that it was more dark than light: cf. the expressions $\beta a \theta \epsilon \hat{i} a \nu$ v́g, $\beta a \theta \in i ̂ a \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho a$.
6. $\theta a v \mu \dot{\zeta} \zeta \omega$ ö $\pi \omega$. Stallbaum quotes Xen. Mem. I. I. 20 Oav-
 'I wonder how it was that etc.': $\theta a v \mu a ́ s \omega ~ \epsilon i$ would mean 'I wonder
 used of answering the door: cf. Phaed. 59 e ó $\theta v \rho \omega \rho$ òs ö $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ є $i \omega \bar{\omega} \theta \epsilon$ $\dot{v} \pi a \kappa \circ v \in \iota \nu$ and $\dot{\dot{v}} \dot{\boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{\pi} \kappa \circ \dot{v} \sigma a s$ of the porter in Xen. Symp. I. Iı.
8. Sıà тò то入入ákıs $\delta \in \hat{p} p o$ фoเтâv. Socrates' friends generally met in the $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau \eta \rho \iota o \nu$, which adjoined the prison (Phaed. 59 D ), and waited till the prison was opened.
9. єv̉ทpyย́ยๆтal. Where initial єủ- or oi-precede a vowel in Attic verbs, "that vowel, and not the initial diphthong, receives the
 (Rutherford, New Phrynichus, p. 245). " $\tau i$ is equivalent to $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \rho$ -
reबiav $\tau \iota \nu \dot{\alpha}(\mathrm{a} \mathrm{tip})$ ）＂Dyer．каi－кal above is＇and also．＇［B and the editors ${ }^{1}$ ，except Kral，read $\left.\epsilon \dot{v} \in \rho \gamma \epsilon \in \tau \eta \tau \alpha L.\right]$



13．єǐтa．On єǐтa indignabundum see Apol． 28 в（ $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\tau} \tau^{\prime}$ oủk 43 в ai $\sigma \chi \dot{\nu} \nu \epsilon ;$ ）and my note there．For $\epsilon i \tau a$ followed by $\pi \hat{\omega} s$ cf．（with
 $\delta \ell \delta \omega s$ 入a $\beta \epsilon i \nu$ ；

15．ov́ $\mu \alpha$ тòv $\Delta i \alpha \kappa \kappa \lambda \lambda$ ．$=$＇no！Socrates，believe me，I could wish that I myself were not so sleepless and sorrowful＇．oú does not anticipate the following oú $\delta \notin$ in oú $\delta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \nu \nu$ av̉rós（ne ipse quidem）， but is part of Crito＇s reply to Socrates＇question，since $\epsilon i \tau a-\pi a \rho a \kappa \alpha ́-$
 displacement of $\tau \epsilon$ Stallbaum compares Phaed．94D $\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \kappa a \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\gamma \nu \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \nu$ каi т $\grave{\eta} \nu$ la $\rho \iota \kappa \eta \dot{\eta}$ ．Wohlrab takes oú as merely antici－ patory of the following negative：I agree with Göbel．

17．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ кal $\sigma o v=-\theta a v \mu a^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ sc．just as you were lately sur－ prised，supra 43 A $\theta a v \mu \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ ö $\pi \omega s \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．For $\theta a v \mu \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ with gen．see Goodwin＇s Greek Grammar p．222．Cron on the other hand takes à入入à кai as＝＇but furthermore＇，while Göbel connects каi $\theta a \nu \mu a ́ s \omega$ with кal oúк $\eta$ クैє $\iota \rho o \nu$ in the next line－＇both－and＇．
 $\epsilon \dot{v} \theta \dot{v} s$ é $\pi \eta \dot{\gamma} \gamma \iota \rho a ́ s ~ \mu \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$ ．By using the conjunctive $\delta \iota a ́ \gamma \eta s$ where at first sight we should expect the optative $\delta$ oa $\gamma o s$ in the next line， Crito contrives to indicate that he still wishes Socrates $\dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{\eta} \delta \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$

 aúv $\hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\delta} \mu 0 \lambda o \gamma \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ ．In Apol． 40 D Socrates declares that nothing is $\alpha ँ \mu \epsilon \omega \nu \nu$ каi $\eta{ }^{\eta} \delta \iota \nu$ than sound dreamless sleep．

19．кal— $\mu \grave{v} \nu \delta \eta$ —кal＝＇yes，and＇：so also кaì $\mu e ̀ \nu ~ \delta \grave{\eta} \kappa \alpha i--\gamma \epsilon$ in Rep．v． 464 B．

20．$\eta$ ú\＆aıцóvıба тov̂ трóтоv．Inscriptions of the age of Plato shew that verbs beginning with $\epsilon \dot{v}-$ regularly had an augment in the secondary tenses：see Rutherford New Phryn． 244 and Meisterhans， Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften 78．Here the MSS and edd． （except Kral）read єúdal $\mu \dot{\nu} \iota \sigma a$ ．On the genitive with $\epsilon \dot{\delta} \delta a u \mu \nu i \zeta \in \epsilon \nu$ compare Goodwin＇s Greek Grammar p．224：and for the sentiment
${ }^{1}$ By＂the editors＂I mean Cron，Schanz，Wohlrab，Göbel and Kral ：see Pretace．
 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda \sigma \gamma \omega \nu$.
21. $\omega$ s $\mathfrak{\rho} \underline{\delta} \delta i \omega s$ i.q. $\delta \tau \iota$ ov゙ $\tau \omega \dot{\rho} q \delta i \omega s$ (Cron).
24. $\tau \eta$ ไıkoûtov ővтa. Socrates was seventy years of age: v. infra $5^{2} \mathrm{E}$.
 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda i \sigma \kappa \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ more often takes the dative without $\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \nu$.
 them from being indignant'. Verbs of hindering, if negative themselves, are regularly followed by $\mu \dot{\eta}$ oú with the infinitive, which may or may not have the article. Goodwin MT. 198 foll. With the present example compare Rep. I. 354 B oủk $\mathfrak{a} \pi \epsilon \sigma \chi \dot{\delta} \mu \eta \nu \tau \grave{\partial} \mu \eta े ~ o u ̉ \kappa-~$
 oú $\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ d ं \tau i \mu \omega s \kappa \tau \lambda$. Whitelaw (Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society III. I, p. 41 foll.) endeavours, I think with success, to prove that both negatives have a value, the infinitive being consecutive. Thus while $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\omega} \lambda \lambda \nu \sigma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \mu \hat{\epsilon} \mu \eta \grave{\eta} \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu=$ 'he hindered
 not hinder me, so that I did not refrain-from-speaking' i.e. keep silence (oủk єimeiv).
 K $\rho i \tau \omega \nu$; on $\pi \rho \varphi \dot{v}$ v. note ibid.
34. èv roîs $\beta$ apúтata. Note the climax: $\chi a \lambda \epsilon \pi \dot{\eta} \nu-\chi a \lambda \in \pi \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\kappa a i l \beta a \rho \in i ̂ a \nu-\epsilon ̇ \nu \tau 0 i ̂ s \beta a \rho u ́ \tau a \tau a$. The phrase $\hat{\epsilon} \nu \tau 0 i ̂ s$ adds emphasis to the superlative. When occurring with the superlative of adjectives, it is best explained by supplying a fresh superlative to agree with the article: this superlative is sometimes expressed, e.g. Cratyl. 427 E ô $\delta \eta \eta^{\eta} \delta o \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \epsilon \in \nu$ tois $\mu \epsilon \gamma i \sigma \tau o c s ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \iota \sigma \tau o \nu$ єival (so the best MSS, but Schanz rejects $\mu \epsilon \gamma^{\prime}(\sigma \tau o s)$ : compare also the kindred expression in Symp. 195 E $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \mu a \lambda \alpha \kappa \omega \tau \alpha \dot{\tau} \sigma \iota s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu a \lambda \alpha \kappa \omega \tau \alpha \dot{\tau} \omega \nu$. When as here the phrase is linked to an adverb, we must repeat the superlative along with a participle supplied from the verb to which the adverb

 become purely adverbial and may be used even with feminine adjectives, as in the well-known $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ roîs $\pi \lambda \epsilon i \not \sigma \tau a \iota ~ \delta \grave{\eta} \nu \hat{\eta} \epsilon \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{III} .17$, where see Classen's note. Compare Kühner, Griechische Grammatik II. 27 .
 my note on Apol. 26 B. The annual mission to Delos, during
which no criminal was put to death at Athens, had begun the day before Socrates' trial, when the priest of Apollo decorated the bow of the vessel with garlands. On this occasion the boat was absent thirty days. The mission was intended to commemorate the deliverance of Athens under Theseus from the annual tribute of young men and maidens sent to Crete : see Phaed. 58 A foll. and Xen. Mem. Iv. 8. 2.
36. $\tau \in \theta$ vával is slightly more emphatic than $\dot{a} \pi \sigma 0 \nu \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ : see
 The infinitive $\theta \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu$ is hardly used by good Attic prose writers, $\dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \theta \nu \eta \eta \dot{\sigma} \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ being used instead: but $\tau \in \in \ell \eta \eta \kappa a$, $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ are alone right, never $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \kappa \alpha, \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \dot{\gamma} \kappa \eta$. Rutherford Babrius p. 36.
37. ov тol $\delta \grave{\eta}$ áфîктaı = 'no, it is true that it has not arrived'.

 as with the Latin videri, the personal construction is generally preferred: if we follow Schanz $\delta o \kappa \epsilon i ́ \nu ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \mu o \iota$ is to be taken as an infinitive used absolutely='in my opinion': cf. Ar. Aves 1235

 and the common phrase $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \omega \dot{\nu} \nu \in \mathfrak{\imath} \nu a \iota$. The construction $\delta о \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \mu 0 \iota$ $\dot{\eta}_{5} \xi \epsilon$ though rare is also allowable: see Phaed. 108 D $\dot{\delta}$ ßios $\mu$ o七
 Schanz, Novae Commentationes p. I 30 ) Menex. 236 в öтє $\mu 0 \iota$ бокє $\hat{\imath}$
 $\delta о к \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ ) without a following $\delta \epsilon$-a frequent idiom in a clause with $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$, the antithesis to which is really contained in the preceding negative clause-compare (with Stallbaum) Prot. $34+\mathrm{A}$ ov่ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ єival, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \notin \sigma \tau \iota \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.
 (Fischer). Cape Sunium was the great landmark for seamen on the South coast of Attica.
 'news' (nuntii) is not found before Polybius. $\epsilon \kappa$ before ${ }^{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$ is like $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ of the agent (conceived of as the source) after passive verbs, e.g. Tim. 47 в $\delta \omega \rho \eta \theta \notin \nu \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \theta \epsilon \omega \hat{\omega}$. Wohlrab and Kral read $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \lambda \iota \omega \hat{\nu}$ with some MSS: Cron, Schanz and Göbel bracket $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu$, on the ground that $\dot{a} \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \hat{\epsilon} \omega \nu$ cannot $=\dot{a} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \iota \omega \hat{\nu}$, and that $\epsilon^{\prime} \kappa$ to express the source must be followed by a neuter or inanimate object: but the example I have cited is enough to defend the idiom.

## CHAPTER II.

Socrates relying on a vision declares that the ship will not arrive till to-morrow.
 be for the best'. The formula is frequent on inscriptions and


 $\phi i \lambda o \nu, \tau a u ́ \tau \eta$ é $\sigma \tau \omega$ compare the last words of the dialogue:

44 A 5. Tท̂ रáp mov. This is the introductory $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho\left(\gamma^{\prime} \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \rho a\right)$ and should not be translated: see on Apol. 20 E Xal $\rho \in \phi \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a \quad \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ í $\sigma \tau \epsilon \pi$
6. $\dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho a i \underline{a}-\eta$ " ท̂. " $\dot{\eta} \pi \rho o \tau \epsilon \rho a i a$ et $\dot{\eta} \dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho a i a$ perpetuo usu rle diebus dicuntur, omisso semper $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha-\pi \rho o \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a$ et $\dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a$ de aliis rebus quibuslibet repetitis, concione, proelio etc." Cobet, Variae Lectiones 246 . The words are often confused with one another in MSS. $\dot{v} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho a i a$ being a virtual comparative is followed by $\eta$. Note the orthography in $\dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \theta \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$ : the $\iota$ is found in B here and infra $4^{6} \mathrm{D}$ and $4^{8} \mathrm{D}$ : inscriptions also furnish evidence to the same effect: see Meisterhans, Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften p. 86. $\theta \nu \eta \eta \prime \sigma \kappa \omega$ is connected with $\theta \in i \nu \omega$, фóvos, Skt. han: the ending -iбк $\omega$ is probably on the analogy of $\sigma \tau \epsilon p-i \sigma \kappa \omega, \dot{\alpha} \lambda i \sigma \kappa о \mu a \iota$ and the like. Compare Gust. Meyer, Griech. Gr. ${ }^{2}$ pp. 259, 45 I.

oi $\tau$ ои́т $\omega \nu$ кúpıo viz. oi $\notin \nu \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha$, the board of eleven (ten ordinary members and a rpauдateús) who had general charge of the prisons and saw that the capital sentence was carried out: Phaed. 59 E, I 16 в foll.
 or that which was just beginning. Soph. O. T. 781 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ ov̂ $\sigma a \nu$
 $\chi{ }^{\circ}$. From Phaedo 59 D -E it appears that Socrates was right: the boat did not arrive till the second day.
10. $\tau a v i \tau \eta s \tau \eta$ § $\boldsymbol{v u k \tau o ́ s : ~ g e n i t i v e ~ o f ~ t i m e ~ w i t h i n ~ w h i c h : ~ G o o d - ~}$ win, Gk. Gr. 227 .
 sational style.
'̇v кaıpê rivt 'peropportune' (Stallbaum). Tis, as Cron remarks, has the effect of a litotes: cf. $\epsilon \chi \chi o \nu$ ăv $\tau \downarrow \nu a$ 入órov Apol. 31 B.



 Socrates was greatly influenced by dreams and oracles and $\mu a v \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$

 story of this vision is also told (inaccurately) by Diogenes Laertius, II. 5. 35, and referred to in Cic. de Div. I. 52. For two other examples see Phaed. 60 E and Diog. Laert. HI. 5. In his respect for divination Socrates presents the most striking contrast to Plato, who places priestcraft and divination in the lowest of the three classes of arts distinguished in the Politicus ( 290 C foll.). See on this subject Nohle's excellent essay "Die Statslehre Platos in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung", Jena, I880.
 of white was significant of joy: compare Legg. xII. 947 B , where Plato in speaking of funerals ordains $\lambda \in u \kappa \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \bar{\epsilon} \nu \tau \bar{\eta} \nu \sigma \tau o \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$ ह̈ $\chi \in \omega$





 suggests) that the meaning of the line for Socrates lay partly in the fact that Phthia was the home of Achilles: but I feel sure that (rightly or wrongly) Socrates associated $\Phi \theta i \eta$ with $\phi \theta i \omega$ and $\phi \theta i \sigma$ is, and derived comfort from the epithet $\bar{e} \rho i \beta \omega \lambda$ गov. In Euripides' Electra 836 there is what seems to me a similar play upon the word $\Phi$ tias. Orestes has been dissecting a victim with a $\Delta \omega \rho \kappa \kappa \grave{\eta}$ кoris, in the presence of Aegisthus. Suddenly he lays it aside and exclaims:
 котioa; With this $\Phi \theta$ càs кoтis he slays Aegisthus. I am glad to find that Lambinus (as a pupil has pointed out to me) took the same view of $\Phi \theta i n \nu$ in this passage. See also infra on 47 B line $1_{4}$.
 reading.
19. '̇vapyès $\mu$ ย̀v oûv 'No, it is plain': on $\mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ oûv (immo) v . above $43 \mathrm{~A} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \nu \mu \grave{e} \nu$ ᄂง̂v.

## CHAPTER III.

Crito entreats Socrates to escape and save the reputation of his friend.
 address in Athenian society. The adjective meant originally 'more than human': in Homer it is generally used as an epithet of reproach, in Attic, of affection coupled with remonstrance (as here), or ironically. $\hat{\omega} \mu \alpha \kappa \alpha ́ p \iota \varepsilon$ is used in the same way. Other kindred expressions are $\hat{\omega} \beta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \tau \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon$, $\hat{\omega}$ ä $\rho \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon$, $\hat{\omega} \lambda \hat{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$, $\hat{\omega} \theta a u \mu a \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon$ : the three first mean 'my excellent friend' or 'my fine fellow' (ironical) : the last 'my dear sir' (with remonstrance). Often the precise shade of meaning can only be conveyed by the tone of the voice in translating aloud.
2. Ëть kal vv̂v. The words imply that Crito had already made many attempts to induce Socrates to escape : cf. infra 48 e $\pi a \hat{v} \sigma a \iota$


 collocation of present and aorist in $\pi \epsilon i \theta$ ov кai $\sigma \dot{\omega} \theta \eta \tau \iota \mathrm{cf}$. Gorg. 486 c where the mss read $\dot{\epsilon} \mu o \dot{\lambda} \pi \epsilon i \theta \circ v, \pi a \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \iota \delta^{\prime} \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \hat{\gamma} \chi \chi \omega \nu$.
3. ov̉ $\mu$ ía $\alpha$ non una $=$ 'more than one'. The Bodleian has ov$\delta \epsilon \mu i \alpha$ : but this can hardly be right. Crito proceeds to enumerate two misfortunes: the loss of his friend and the loss of his reputation. Observe that Crito thinks his reputation will suffer more if Socrates remains to die than if he breaks his own pledge to the Athenian people by inducing Socrates to escape: see Phaed. II 5 D. In Crito's judgment (and Crito here as elsewhere represents the average Athenian gentleman of the day) it is a higher duty to serve one's friend than to be true to one's country. It is this point of view which Socrates combats in the sequel, as utterly fatal to the very existence of the State.
4. $X \omega \rho)$ s $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu-\alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a l$. I have retained the reading of the Bodleian, which all the recent editors have changed. $\chi \omega$ pis is an adverb, as the balance between $\chi \omega \rho i s \mu \in ́ v$ and. $\epsilon \tau \tau \iota \in \notin$ proves (see also Madvig Adv. I. 369) : to regard it as a preposition makes it necessary either to insert $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ before $\sigma o \hat{v}$ (as Ast does), or to change $\sigma o \hat{v}$ to $\tau 0 \hat{y}$ with most editors. If we follow the mss, the construction is $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$

 second half of the antithesis because $\chi \omega \rho i s \delta^{\prime}$ would require каi
 this would be awkward, with $\epsilon \sigma \tau i \nu$ so far removed. For $\chi \omega \rho i s \mu \epsilon \bar{\nu}$
 much to be said for reading $\tau o \hat{v}$, not $\sigma o \hat{u} \dagger$. Translate the whole sentence as it stands thus: 'For to me your death is more than a single calamity: on the one hand, there is the loss of you, a friend such as I shall never find again, and moreover many men, who do not know you and me well, will think me guilty of neglect, because I might have saved you, if I had been willing to spend money'. $\dot{\omega}$ s oiós $\tau^{\prime} \dot{\omega}^{\prime \prime} \nu$ is explanatory of $\dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$.
 in Plato as in Attic generally: either 'I am debarred from', or ' I am deprived of': an example of the former meaning is Rep. vi.


 is of course future. ov $\mu$ ' with the future indicative (rare), or (far more often) the aorist conjunctive (cf. infr. 46 c ov $\left.\mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \circ \iota \xi \cup \gamma \chi \omega \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma\right)$, is a strong negative : for the sense of futurity in the aorist conjunctive compare $\pi i-0-\mu \alpha \ell$, $\bar{\varepsilon} \delta-o-\mu a \iota$ (conjunctives with the short vowel as in $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}(i-o-\mu \epsilon \nu)$ and perhaps Latin faxo, i.e. fac-s-o: see my note on Apol. 29 D and compare Goodwin MT. p. 184.
7. of - $\mu \dot{\eta}$ そ $\sigma a \sigma \iota v$. Not oi-ou because the clause is virtually conditional: no one who knew Crito and Socrates well could imagine that Crito had treated him with neglect.
 'I might have saved you'. This clause is explained by $\dot{\alpha} \mu \in \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota$ : it was because Crito had the money, and didn't use it, that ignorant men might charge him with neglect: had he been penniless, he would have escaped the charge. Crito was very well off: see Eu-

+ This view is taken by Otto Apelt in a review of my first Edition in the 'Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift' for Dec. 15, 1888.
thyd. 304 C. Cron and Göbel take ís to mean 'although': so Schanz in Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien, Vol. 20 (1869) p. 87, comparing the concessive use of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon$ or $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i-\gamma \epsilon$ in Prot.

 only in the modern idiom that even this use of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i$ is concessive: to the Greeks it was causal, 'for, as for the many, they etc.' Note the iota subscript in $\sigma \dot{\Psi} \zeta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ : it is regularly found in the present stem of this verb down to 160 B.C.: see Meisterhans, Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften, p. 87.
 refers forward, not to $\delta о к \epsilon i \nu$, but to $\eta$ ท̈ סокєiv. For a similar case see
 $\theta \rho \omega \pi$ os, $\eta^{n} \tau$ ov̂ $\tau$ o $\kappa \tau \lambda$. and Cicero De Fin. I. 19 quo nihil turpius physico, quam fieri quicquam sine causa dicere. For the repetition of $\delta$ окєî̀ after $\delta o ́ \xi \alpha$ compare infr. 53 в $\beta \epsilon \beta a \iota \omega ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ тоîs $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$

 himself very lofty views on the subject of friendship: see Mem. II.
 оல̉к ä̀ $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega}$ креітт $\omega \nu$ фavei $;$; ibid. § I he censures the many for saying that a true and good friend is the best of all possessions, and yet caring more for money than for friends.

 opinion of the many is worthless, in comparison with that of the man who knows: see my introduction to the Apology p. x. and the passages there cited.

15. фpovti'giv with a genitive, as often in Plato, e.g. Soph.

av่ $\alpha$ is frequently used, without any expressed antecedent, for the



$44 \mathrm{D} \quad$ 18. aủtà $\delta \underset{\text { è }}{\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a \text {. This use of aủtá throws light on aưtika }}$ (from aủrós) in the sense of 'for example'. $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \alpha$ (sc. $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu)$ is passive :
 see thee, who thou art'. As to the omission of the copula it should be noted that Plato rarely leaves it out except in the present indicative ( $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu$ is more often omitted than $\epsilon i$ or $\epsilon i \mu i)$, and in the present infinitive: see Schanz, Novae Commentationes Platonicae, p. 3 I foll.

 $\zeta \eta \tau a \iota$, oü $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \rho$ каi $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \iota \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, i.e. it has reference to a court of law. With aúrois alone the phrase would mean 'at odds with them':

 Compare our colloquial 'You ought to have been there'. $\epsilon l$ in wishes is not to be explained by assuming an ellipse of the apodosis: it is more probable that $\epsilon i$ in conditional sentences is a later use, derived from the use of $\epsilon l=\sigma F \epsilon l$, cf. sei in Plautus and si-cc(e) to introduce a wish. See Monro's Honeric Grammar, p. 232 foll.
16. iva oioi $\tau$ ' $\hat{\sigma} \sigma a v=$ ' that they might have been able '. iva, ö $\pi \omega$ s, etc. are used with a secondary tense of the indicative (without $a ̉ \nu)$ in final clauses depending on a wish that can no longer be realised, or on the apodosis to an impossible protasis: see Goodwin MT. p. 72 . A similar rule holds for $\pi \rho i \nu$ and $\notin \omega s$ : Goodwin 145, 144. Scribes frequently misunderstand the idiom and corrupt the text either ( $a$ ) by inserting $d \nu$, or (b) by changing the indicatives to conjunctives or optatives: see Cobet, Variae Lectiones pp. 102, 359. Two passages, so far as I know, have not yet been emended. Marc. Aurelius,



 where we should read $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a \rho a ́ \xi a s$ and possibly $\epsilon \xi \xi i \lambda \lambda \epsilon$, unless the corruption in $\epsilon^{\xi} \xi \in \in \in \eta \eta$ lies deeper.
 the $\alpha \partial \nu$ shews, but an independent clause.

The statement that a power to do harm implies the power of doing good rests on the Socratic doctrine that virtue is knowledge. If we know what is good, we are good, but we cannot know what is good without knowing what is evil (this Socrates proved by the analogy of the arts), and so being able to do what is evil: conversely, the power to do evil implies the power to do good. This is all worked out at length in the Hippias Minor (a genuine dialogue), where it is proved that the veracious man is ó $\delta v \nu a \dot{a} \mu \nu \nu o s \psi \in \dot{v} \delta \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ :


$\nu$ v̂v $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}=$ 'but as it is': see on Apol. 18 A and Prot. 335 C (quoted there) $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \sigma \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu \sigma v \gamma \chi \omega \rho \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu-\nu \hat{v} \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta}$ oíк
'̇ध' $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon s \kappa \tau \lambda$. The Latin is 'nunc'. ov $\dot{\delta} \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho a$ in the next line is probably adverbial as in Theaet. 184 A ( $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \delta \delta \hat{\xi}$ oú $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho a$ i.e. neither $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \pi a \rho \hat{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \varphi \sigma \kappa \dot{\epsilon} \psi a \sigma \theta a \iota$ nor $\left.\mathfrak{i} \kappa \alpha \nu \hat{\omega} s \sigma_{\kappa} \dot{\epsilon} \psi a \sigma \theta a \iota\right)$, although here it would be easy to supply $\epsilon_{\xi} \epsilon \in \gamma \alpha \dot{\beta} \xi \sigma \theta a \iota$.
 not mean 'they act wholly at random' (Church), as all the editors take it: had Plato meant that, he would have written $\pi \rho \alpha \dot{\tau} \tau 0 v \sigma \iota$ as in

 is quite usual: cf. infra 5 I A. Translate: 'they treat a man just as it occurs to them'. Cf. Gorgias 52 I C $\dot{\alpha} \nu o ́ \eta \tau o s ~ a ̈ p a ~ \epsilon i \mu \ell, ~ \hat{\omega} \mathrm{~K} a \lambda \lambda i \kappa \lambda \epsilon \iota s$,
 $\pi \alpha \theta \epsilon i \nu$. Ibid. $5^{22}$ C (which Stallbaum actually quotes to illustrate his view, as if $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ could be a passive to $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ as well as to
 means that 'the many' are altogether thoughtless in their treatment of the individual: witness the way in which Miltiades, Cimon and Pericles were treated (Gorg. 515 E-516 E). They would lightly put a man to death and just as lightly bring him to life again if they could: see infra $48 \mathrm{C} \mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\omega} s \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s \tau a \hat{v} \tau a$, $\hat{\omega} \mathrm{K} \rho i \tau \omega \nu, \sigma \kappa \hat{\epsilon} \mu \mu a \tau a$ $\hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\rho} \not \dot{\partial} \dot{\delta} \omega s \dot{\alpha} \pi о \kappa \tau \iota \nu \nu \dot{v} \nu \tau \omega \nu \kappa \alpha i \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \beta \iota \omega \sigma \kappa о \mu \epsilon \nu \omega \nu \quad \gamma^{\prime}{ }^{\alpha} \nu$, $\epsilon i$ oioi $\tau$ ' $\hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu, ~ o u ̛ \delta \epsilon \nu i \xi \dot{\nu} \nu \nu \hat{\varphi}, \tau o u ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu$.

## CHAPTER IV.

In this chapter Crito urges Socrates not to let the fear of danger to his friends or exile to himself prevent him from absconding.
$44 \mathrm{E} \quad$ I. $\mu \dot{̀} \nu \delta \bar{\eta}$. This particle is regularly used to indicate that some topic is concluded. So at the end of speeches oi $\mu \grave{\iota} \nu \delta \grave{\eta}$ tâ̂ta ${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \gamma \nu$, and the tragic rolaûra $\mu . \bar{\epsilon} \nu$ oì rẫ ra. Note the contrast between $\tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha$ retrospective and $\tau \alpha ́ \delta \epsilon$ prospective.
2. ${ }^{\mathfrak{i} p \alpha} \gamma^{\epsilon} \mu \eta^{\prime}$. $\dot{\alpha} \rho \alpha$ or $\dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon$ (the addition of $\gamma \epsilon$ makes the question more animated) merely indicates that a question is asked:
 expects the answer 'yes'. $\mu \dot{\eta}(\mu \hat{\omega} \nu)$ can of course stand by itself in the sense of num? as ov in the sense of nonne?
3. $\pi \rho \sigma \mu \eta \theta \in \hat{\imath}-\mu \eta$. $\quad \pi \rho \rho \mu \eta \theta \epsilon \bar{i} \sigma \theta a$ being virtually a verb of fearing is followed by $\mu \eta$.
4. oi $\sigma v k \neq \alpha$ ával 'the informers'. The great part played by the law-courts and litigation in Athenian life caused a class of informers to spring up, resembling the 'delatores' of the early Roman empire. The origin of the name is obscure: see Liddell and Scott s. v., where a suggestion of Mr Lancelot Shadwell is quoted, according to which the word originally means 'one who brings figs to light by shaking the trees': and then metaphorically 'one who makes rich men yield up their fruit by accusations and other vile

5. $\pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau a$ тарє́Х $\omega \sigma เ \nu$ of a prolonged action ) ( $\dot{\alpha} \nu а \gamma \kappa \alpha \sigma \theta \hat{\omega} \mu \in \nu$ of the act and nothing more.
6. $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \boldsymbol{a l}-\eta$ ŋ $-\eta \boldsymbol{k} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{i}=$ aut adeo-aut certe-aut etiam.
7. $\alpha \pi \sigma \beta a \lambda \in \hat{v} v$ is used both of voluntary and of involuntary



9. Siкaw' ' $\epsilon \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu=$ 'it is right that we'. The Greek idiom is 45 A personal while ours is impersonal. Goodwin MT. p. 195.
 idiomatic expression $=$ 'to refuse', 'to decline': Symp. 173 E $\mu$ خे
 Aristoph. Aves 133 каi $\mu \eta \delta \alpha \mu \hat{\omega} \stackrel{\partial}{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega s \pi o \iota \eta \sigma \eta s$. The expression does not seem to occur except in prohibitions or entreaties with $\mu \eta$ : see Schanz, Novae Commentationes Platonicae p. 25.
12. кal $\tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha \pi \rho о \mu \eta \theta \circ \hat{\mu} \mu \alpha-\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \alpha$. Socrates lets the Laws reply infra 53 в.
14. $\mu \eta \dot{\prime} \tau \epsilon$ тoivvv. Note the effective balance: каl $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha-\kappa a l$ $\ddot{\alpha}^{\lambda} \lambda \lambda a \pi o \lambda \lambda \alpha ́$, says Socrates : $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon-\tau a \hat{\nu} \tau a-\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \lambda$. says Crito. T'he second $\mu \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon$ is in 45 B , line 24: Crito's earnestness has an injurious effect upon his style: observe for example the recurrence of ${ }^{\prime}$ ' $\pi \epsilon \iota \tau a$ within three lines just below. Wohirab takes a somewhat different view: "Crito ut ipse hebetioris erat ingenii, ita oratio eius non nullis locis durior est minusque elegans".
kal $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ov่ $\delta \hat{\epsilon}=$ neque enim.
15. Oénovar. Even after a vowel Plato more frequently uses $\epsilon^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ than $\theta \epsilon \in \lambda \omega$ : yet Phaed. 77 с $\epsilon i \theta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ : ibid. ir 5 в $\left.\mu\right\rangle \dot{j} \theta \epsilon \lambda \eta \tau \epsilon$ : Symp. 190 D $\mu \eta^{\prime} \theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \lambda \omega \sigma t \nu:$ Schanz Nov. Comment. Plat. p. 102.
17. тoútovs тov̀s бukoфávтas. тoútous $=$ 'istos' expresses contempt: so very frequently in Greek: cf. Symp. 181 e toútous roùs тavoíرдous épaotás. Our English 'your' is often used in the same way.

єv่тє $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \hat{\mathbf{s}}=$＝cheap＇：Crito contemptuously speaks of the informers as a commodity to be bought．We are told in the Memorabilia（iI． 9）that Crito had himself suffered much from the бvкофávтaı until following the advice of Socrates he engaged a vigorous but poor friend Archedemus to retaliate．

18．＇ $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi$＇avitov́s＝＇for them＇：there is much scorn in this phrase． $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ in this sense is regularly used of inanimate objects（ $\epsilon^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}$ aúrò $\tau 0 \hat{\tau o}$ line 22）：the idea implied in $\epsilon \dot{u} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i ̂ s ~ i s ~ t h e r e f o r e ~ k e p t ~ u p . ~$

бol $\delta \grave{̀} \dot{v} \pi \pi a ́ p X \in \mathrm{~L}$ ．$\sigma o l$ is emphatic ）（ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \pi^{\prime}$ av̉roús．
 generally precede the word or phrase which they modify：cf．infr．
 $\pi \alpha ́ \nu v ~ к а \tau \alpha ф \rho о \nu \omega ̂ \nu ~ a ́ \pi \alpha ́ v \tau \omega \nu$ ，and ibid． 462 A ．

20．є́ $\mu \mathbf{0} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \boldsymbol{\kappa} \delta \delta o ́ \mu \in \nu о s:$ on account of the danger from the бvко－ фávala，not of course for the loss of the money．Socrates did not think money a good nor the loss of it an evil，either in his own case or in that of his friends：see Apol． $3^{8}$ в，where he proposes the penalty of 30 minae，to be paid by Plato and Crito and others．
 фávtal．The pronoun oûtol is deictic：＇see！here are foreigners ready to spend theirs＇．Crito in his animation speaks as if the $\xi_{\xi} \in \dot{\varepsilon} \nu o \iota$ were actually present in the prison：＂de degentibus in urbe quosque fere quotidie videbat quasi de praesentibus loquitur Crito＂ （Buttmann）．So in Symp．175 A ä入入ov $\delta$ é $\tau \iota \nu a \tau \omega ิ \nu \pi a i \delta \omega \nu \nu \eta ँ \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$

 means＇in Athens＇．There is a certain awkwardness in the collo－
 to omit either of the two words．Crito is somewhat excited and prefers expressiveness to logic：see on 45 A line 14 above．The omission of the copula with éro九 $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{0}$ is common but not universal in
 Novae Comment．Plat．p． 35 ．

22．＇̇́ $\pi^{\prime}$ aútò тov̂to ：see on line 18 （ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi^{\prime}$ aủtoús）above．
 a Theban）play a prominent part in the discussion about immor－ tality in the Phaedo．See Archer－Hind＇s edition of the dialogue pp．40－42．
23. ü $\lambda \lambda$ oı $\pi$ o $\lambda \lambda$ ol $\pi a^{\prime} v v_{\text {. }}$ No cloubt some or all of those named in Phaed. 59 B-C as present at the death of Socrates.
24. ©̋ $\pi \in \rho$ $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \omega$ : viz. supra line 14. In such phrases the present is preferred to the past: see on ö $\pi \epsilon \rho \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \omega$ Apol. 21 A.

גंтока́ $\mu \eta$ s. $\dot{\alpha} \pi о к а ́ \mu \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ is to give over from weariness : cf. infra
 sometimes absolutely (especially in phrases like Rep. IV. 435 D $\mu \grave{\eta}$ тoívv̀ ámока́ $\mu \eta$ s à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ бкó $\pi \epsilon t$ : see Schanz, N. C. Pl. 25 note 2 ), sometimes with a participle: this seems to be the only passage where he has an infinitive following it, but cf. Eur. Ion 134-135 $\mu \circ \chi \theta \in \hat{\imath} \nu$ oủ $\dot{\alpha} \pi$ ок $\alpha, \mu \nu \omega$. Jacobs is here guilty of the solecism $\mu_{i}$ ) $\dot{\alpha} \pi \neq \kappa \nu \hat{\eta} s$, which is also printed by Schanz in his text.

$\delta v \sigma \chi \in \rho \in \epsilon^{s}$ бot $\gamma \in \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta=$ 'trouble you'. It may have seemed little to Crito that Socrates should be false to what was said in the excitement of his defence when he himself was ready to break his deliberate promise to the Athenian people: see above on 44 C line 3. On $\mu \dot{\eta}$ with the $3^{\text {rd }}$ person of the Aorist Imperative see Goodwin MT. 181.
 $\beta i o s ~ \epsilon i ̈ \eta ~ \dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \lambda \theta \dot{\sigma} \nu \tau \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$. This shews that $\dot{\epsilon}_{\xi} \in \lambda \theta \omega \dot{\omega} \nu$ refers to quitting Athens, not to quitting the prison.
 $\chi^{\dot{\delta} \sigma \epsilon}$ would not mend matters, since $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \pi \hat{a} y, \pi o t$ is not Greek. The phrase is not strictly grammatical: кai= 'also', not 'and'. ä $\lambda \lambda o \sigma \epsilon$ is of course attracted to the following relative, as in $\beta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota \kappa \in i \theta \in \nu$ $\ddot{\partial} \theta \epsilon \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \eta ँ \kappa \epsilon \iota$ in Soph. O. C. 1227.
28. eis Oetraniav. According to Diog. Laert. II. 5. ${ }^{25}$ So- 45 C crates declined invitations from Scopas of Crannon and Eurylochus of Larissa. The story that he refused an invitation to the court of Archelaus (whither Euripides, Agathon, Zeuxis and others went) is better authenticated: see Arist. Rhet. III. 23. 1398a $24 \Sigma \omega \kappa \rho \dot{a} \tau \eta s$

 with Thessaly is significant as to his political sympathies: in so far as he felt any interest in politics, he favoured the кa入ol кad $\gamma \Delta \theta 0 l$ or oligarchical party.

## CHAPTER V .

Crito concludes his appeal to Socrates by urging that it is wrong to choose the more indolent course and remain to die: he ought to think of his children and his friends.
 Apol. 35 B (the concluding part of Socrates' appeal as this is of
 $\kappa \tau \lambda$. It is not correct to translate סikatov here as 'just': it is 'right', 'moral'. This is the original meaning of the word, and far
 the other three cardinal virtues. Aristotle recognises both meanings of the word: see Eth. v. $1129^{\text {b }} 25$ where the pseudo-Theognic
 to illustrate the wider meaning. It was this sense that Socrates assigned to the word when he declared $\tau \grave{o}$ Siкalov to be identical with $\tau$ ò $\nu o ́ \mu \iota \mu \nu \nu$ : see Mem. IV. 4. I2 and cf. Introd. p. xiii. This wider meaning survives in the English 'justify'.
 neuter noun denoting some inanimate object. Wohlrab compares
 explanatory of $\pi \rho \hat{\gamma} \gamma \mu a$, to which it stands in apposition.
3. kai тoเav̂ta $\sigma \pi \in v \in \delta \epsilon \iota$. There is more force and indignation in $\sigma \pi \epsilon v ́ \delta \epsilon \iota$ than $\sigma \pi \epsilon v \dot{\delta} \epsilon \iota \nu$ would have conveyed.

Crito means that Socrates' defence was meaningless unless he regarded it as important that he should live. He had spoken of himself as God's minister to the Athenians: was he to desert his post because they rejected him? See Apol. Chapter xviir.


7. vieîs. Socrates had three sons: Lamprocles and two others. Lamprocles was the eldest (Mem. II. 2. I) ; but he was still a youth when Socrates died (Apol. 34 D): the other two were children (Apol. 1. c. and Phaed. if6 в). We do not know whether they suffered in any way from their father's death. For the form vieis see my note on Apol. 20 A : the forms of the second declension (except viéos vici as well as viov vi( $\hat{\varphi})$ are preferred in the singular: those of the third in the dual and plural. Attic inscriptions of Plato's time more often omit the $\iota$ than not (úos víoos etc. See Meisterhans, Gram-
matik der Attischen Inschriften, p. 62) : there are traces of the same omission in some MSS of Plato, and Schanz now everywhere writes the word without the $\iota$ (see his preface to the Laws p. viii).
$\pi \rho o \delta \iota \delta o ́ v a \iota=\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \pi \rho \circ \delta o i ̂ \nu a l$, whence the present. So $\delta \iota \delta \delta \delta \nu a \iota$ often means 'to offer'.
 already begun: whence the preposition: cf. infra $50 \mathrm{E} \epsilon \in \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \not \eta s$ (Socrates was a grown man) кai €̇ $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon \dot{u} \theta \eta s . \quad \tau \rho \circ \nsim \eta^{\prime}$ is rather personal and moral surveillance than intellectual: $\pi \alpha \downarrow \delta \in i a$ vice versa.
 words imply that there would be something selfish and cowardly in the betrayal. $\tau$ ò $\sigma \grave{\nu} \nu \mu \notin \rho o s=$ pro tua parte, quod ad te attinet (Cron): so infra s० $^{\text {B. }}$
 to fare as chance directs', 'they will have to take their chance in life': ő $\tau \iota a ̆ \nu \tau u ́ \chi \omega \sigma \iota$ as in 44 D. With $\tau 0 u ̂ \tau o \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ cf. ả̧a日óv $\tau \iota$ $\pi \rho a ́ \xi o \nu \tau \epsilon s$ Alc. II. 141 D .
11. év raîs ópфaviaıs-ópфavov́s. Göbel points out that the repetition of the idea has a pathetic effect.

 owes a duty to one's family as well as to the State: Socrates placed his duty to the State before his duty to his family. $\pi$ olfīə | al $\pi a i ̂ \delta a s$ |
| :--- | i. q. $\pi a \iota \delta o \pi o t \epsilon \hat{\imath} \theta \theta a$.

 that Crito contrasted the indifference of Socrates with the zeal displayed in his behalf by himself and the others: there is a touch of injured friendship about these words. See the reply of Socrates in
 there.
16. ф'́бкovтá $\gamma \epsilon \delta \eta^{\prime}=$ quippe qui dicat. The touch of sarcasm in фá $\sigma \kappa \frac{\nu}{\sigma} \alpha$ is made sharper by the addition of $\delta \dot{\eta}$. For the assertion itself compare Apol. 30 A and 37 B. סià mavtòs roû $\beta i o u$ has more force if taken with фá⿱коутa than with $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \theta a \iota$.
 may be followed by $\dot{\omega}$ in the sense of 'for'.


 (already implied in $\dot{\rho} \not a \theta v \mu o ́ \tau \alpha \tau \alpha$ of 14 and $\dot{\alpha} \nu \grave{\eta} \rho \dot{\alpha} \gamma a \theta$ òs каì à $\nu \delta \rho \in i o s$ of 15 ) is openly made: for by $\dot{\eta} \mu \in \tau \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \rho($ as is clear from $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \rho \sigma o \hat{v}$ in

17 and oưsè $\sigma \dot{v}$ бautóv in 25) Socrates is meant as well as Crito and his friends. It is implied that death requires less courage than life -a view which Socrates himself held. The reproach is made less biting by $\tau \omega \nu$.
 тоvті-Soкєîv. This explains in detail ätav $\tau \grave{\partial} \pi \rho a \hat{\gamma} \gamma \mu$. There is clearly an allusion to the stage. The tragedy begins-( $\epsilon i \sigma \circ \delta \circ s)$ develops (aúròs $\dot{o} \dot{a} \gamma(\omega \dot{\nu})$ )-and ends in a fiasco ( $\omega$ 位 $\pi \epsilon \rho \kappa а \tau a ́ \gamma \epsilon \lambda \omega s \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\left.\pi \rho d{ }_{s} \epsilon \omega \mathrm{~s}\right)$ : "solvuntur risu tabulae". The words are carefully chosen to suggest the comparison. eilooios may be used both of the entrance of an actor (compare the use of $\epsilon i \sigma \alpha \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ in Apol. 35 B), and of the coming on of a law-suit (see on Apol. 24 D) : á $\gamma \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$ signifies 'acting' as well as 'pleading': the word always implies rivalry as well as publicity.
21. єiซ $\hat{\eta} \lambda \theta$ es. So $I$ read with $E$ and the second hand in $B$ : the editors (except Stallbaum) generally read $\epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$. The latter is very idiomatic Greek, for ciofeploua九 is used in this way as the passive to $\epsilon i \sigma \alpha ́ \gamma \omega$ : compare Dem. $\pi$ pòs $\Lambda \alpha ́ \kappa \rho \iota \tau o \nu ~ 49 \pi o ̂ ̂ ~ o u ̂ v ~ \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} ~ \tau a u ́ t \eta \nu ~$ $\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta i \kappa \eta \nu$, but (see following note) $\epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \epsilon$ goes better with $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \grave{\partial} \nu \mu \grave{\eta} \epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon i \nu:$ cf. also on 45 E infra какía $\tau \iota \nu i-\delta о к \epsilon i \nu$.
é $\xi \grave{\nu} \nu(s c . \sigma o \iota) \mu \eta ̀ ~ \epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \in i ̂ v$. Crito probably means that Socrates might have effected his escape in the interval between the lodging of the indictment with the King Archon and the actual trial. Had he done so, the case would have been decided against him by default, see on $\epsilon \rho \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$ кат $\eta \gamma$ оро̂̂̀tєs Apol. i8 c. If we read $\dot{\omega} s$ $\epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$ and not $\dot{\omega} s \epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon s$, we must understand aủ $\frac{\eta}{\eta}$ i.e. $\tau \hat{\eta} \delta i \kappa \eta$ after $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \hat{\xi}^{\circ} \nu$ : this can hardly be right, for even if Socrates had absconded the trial would have come on: the only difference would have been the absence of the defendant. There is no good authority for the tradition that Anytus wished to make terms with Socrates after the indictment had been lodged; nor would such a course have been tolerated by Athenian law, since $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \dot{\xi} \beta \epsilon \iota a$ was a $\gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\eta}$ or offence against the State, not a $\delta i \kappa \eta$ or lawsuit with a private individual.
 $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon \iota \alpha$ as it were or catastrophe of the tragedy. The Bodleian has $\delta \eta \eta^{\prime}$ ov.
23. $\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ катá $\gamma \in \lambda \omega s$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \rho \alpha ́ \xi \epsilon \omega s=$ 'a reductio ad absurdum as one might say of the whole affair'. $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \rho \alpha^{\prime} \xi \in \omega$ s is an objective genitive: cf. Aesch. Ag. $126_{4} \tau i \delta \hat{\eta} \tau^{\prime}, \epsilon^{\prime} \mu a v \tau \hat{\eta} S \kappa \alpha \tau a \gamma \epsilon \in \lambda \omega \tau^{\prime}, \epsilon^{\epsilon} \chi \omega$ $\tau a ́ \delta \epsilon \kappa а i \sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho a \kappa a i \mu a \nu \tau \epsilon i a \pi \epsilon \rho i \delta \dot{\epsilon} \rho \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi \eta$; See the retort of the


 us the slip, through a sort of cowardice and unmanliness on our
 $\pi \rho o \delta o u ̂ v a l$ is of $\pi \rho a \hat{\gamma \mu a}$ in 45 C line 2. The subject to $\delta о \kappa \epsilon \hat{i} \nu$ is $\sigma \epsilon$ : this is easily supplied from the context ( $\tau \grave{\partial} \pi \rho \hat{\alpha} \gamma \mu a \tau \grave{\partial} \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \sigma \epsilon$ in 19 and $\dot{\omega} s \epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon s$ in 21). For the expression compare Phaed. ${ }^{115} 5$

 Göbel takes $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s ~ a s ~ s u b j e c t ~ t o ~ \delta o к \epsilon i ̀ \nu: ~ W o h l r a b ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \tau a i ̂ o \nu ~$ $\delta \grave{\eta}$ rout $i$ : the other editors fail to give any clear explanation of this difficult passage. There is some awkwardness in having סокєiv $\delta \iota a-$ $\pi \epsilon \phi \epsilon \cup \gamma \epsilon \in \operatorname{lol}$ as virtually a subject to $\delta \dot{\delta} \xi \eta$ in line 18 above: but the grammatical subject is $\tau o v \tau l$, to which $\delta o \kappa \varepsilon i v$ is in apposition. Mudge conjectures $\delta$ oк $\hat{\eta}$, but the text is quite sound.
${ }^{25}$. oúSè $\sigma$ v̀ $\sigma$ avoóv. The relative clause passes into a main 46 A


 $\alpha \dot{u} \tau 0 \hat{v}$, and see my note on Apol. 40 A ä $\gamma \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta}$ оiŋ $\theta \epsilon i \eta$-каi $\nu о \mu i \zeta \epsilon \tau a \iota$.
oióv $\tau \in$ ỏv кal $\delta$ vvaróv. The twofold expression is for emphasis : cf. infra line 3 I dáóvatov каì оúкє́тє oioò $\tau \epsilon$. oióv $\tau \epsilon$ is 'feasible': ovvađón 'possible'.
27. $\ddot{\alpha}_{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{\alpha} \tau \hat{\varphi} \kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\varphi} . \quad$ ä $\mu \alpha$ is used in much the same way as $\pi \rho o ́ s: ~$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\omega}$ is substantival. So in the Gorgias ( 474 E foll.) тò aio $\chi \rho o ́ v$ is defined as that which is at once $\lambda v \pi \eta \rho o ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \kappa а i$ какó $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ : see also 475 в


28. $\mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o v \delta \epsilon ́=$ vel potius, as in Gorg. 449 A $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \delta \hat{\epsilon}, \hat{\omega}$


 $\lambda \epsilon u ́ \mu \in \theta a$." Jacobs. Note the fourfold recurrence of $\beta$ ou $\lambda \epsilon u \in \epsilon \sigma \theta a$, (३ои入ท́).

 Socrates one night more in which to effect his escape. With $\tau \hat{\eta} s$



## CHAPTER VI.

Crito's pleading is now concluded. In reply, Socrates begins by laying down the principles which should guide his decision. He first recalls one great doctrine on which he had insisted throughout all his life, viz. that no opinions are worth regarding except the opinions of those who know. See Introduction pp. xi and xii.
 conditional sentence" Goodwin MT. ri8. It would not be possible to understand $\partial \nu \nu i \eta$ : if the optative of the copula is omitted in an apodosis with $a \partial \nu$, the $\ddot{\alpha} \nu$ must be inserted: see Meno 96 в oúкoû $\in i$

 cases like the present Greek prefers the more dogmatic form of expression. Note $\epsilon i-\epsilon i \eta$ and not $\epsilon i-\eta_{i} \nu$ : Socrates speaks as one who has not yet made up his mind-ready to follow ör $\eta$ ä $\nu$ ó $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~ \omega ̈ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu \alpha{ }^{\prime} \dot{\rho} \rho \eta$ (Rep. III. 394 D).
4. $\sigma \kappa 0 \pi \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \theta$ at is placed in the emphatic position at the beginning

5. ov̉ $\mu$ óvov vûv. So the MSS : there is no reason to read oủ $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu$ with Nauck and Schanz. The omission of the copula is not very common in Plato except when it is $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu$ : yet cf. Prot. 335 C $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}$
 $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \dot{i} \nu \omega \nu$. $\hat{\epsilon} \hat{l}$ and $\hat{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ are also sometimes omitted: $\dot{\eta}^{\nu} \nu$ rarely, except in the phrase $\epsilon i \mu \eta \partial \delta \iota \alpha ́ \tau \iota \nu \alpha(\sigma \epsilon \in$ or the like) : parts of the conjunctive and optative are very seldom omitted: cival however is left out very frequently. See Schanz, Novae Comm. Pl. 3 r-35*
 Crito's $\pi \epsilon i \theta o v \mu 0 \iota$ ( 46 A ), for $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon \epsilon \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ includes Socrates' friends as well as everything else that could be called his.
 rule of life. For example, before entering on a line of conduct he would inquire if it harmonised with the conception or definition ( $\lambda$ ó $\gamma o s$ ) of $\tau \grave{\partial}$ diкalov which he had arrived at by the exercise of his reason : and if it did, nothing ever deterred him from so acting: see my Introduction to the Apology p. xi; compare also Phaed. 100 A, where Plato uses the phraseology of the Socratic method to de-





 rocoûrov, $\mu \grave{\eta} \phi \hat{\omega}$ : and compare as to this point Dr Jackson on the "incomplete Protagoreans" of the Theaetetus in Journal of Philology, Vol. xili. 249-250.
9. Encyov: imperfect, because Socrates is referring to the teaching of his whole life. Infra $\epsilon \in \kappa \beta a \lambda \epsilon i \nu=$ 'throw over', 'discard',


 $\sigma \alpha \nu \tau \varphi \hat{\epsilon}$ є́к $\sigma \tau \tau о \tau \epsilon \quad \gamma l \gamma \nu \in \sigma \theta a \iota$.
10. öroto (sc. $\lambda o ́ \gamma o t$ ) is probably the subject and not the predicate, otherwise in place of $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \beta a \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ we should expect a word $=$ 'to change': the predicate is фaipovtal (sc. $\beta \in \lambda \tau \iota \sigma \tau o \iota$ ). $8 \mu 0 \% o \iota$ is not $=$ oi aúroi (idem) but $=$ Latin similes: the two ideas are carefully distinguished in Theaet. 159 A $\epsilon l$ ă $\rho a \quad \tau \iota \sigma \nu \mu \beta a i \nu \epsilon \iota$ ö $\mu$ oıó $\nu \tau \psi$
 $\nu \in \sigma \theta \alpha \iota, \dot{\alpha} \nu \circ \mu \circ \iota \circ \dot{\cup} \mu \in \nu \circ \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \ddot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu ; \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha ́ \gamma \kappa \eta$. Socrates becomes
 $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \in \dot{\prime} \omega \kappa \tau \lambda$.
11. $\pi p \in \sigma \beta \in v \in \omega$ is a lofty and somewhat poetic word, frequently 46 C used of regard paid to the gods.


 in Rep. $39^{6}$ D $\hat{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \dot{\epsilon} \tau \tau \omega$ $\delta \hat{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha i \hat{\eta} \tau \tau \tau \nu-\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \phi a \lambda \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu 0 \nu$ : cf. also infra
 in the Greek nursery (see Theocr. xv. 40 оủk $\mathfrak{a} \xi \hat{\omega} \omega \tau, \tau \notin \kappa \nu 0 \nu$. Mop $\mu \dot{\omega}$ - $\delta \dot{\alpha} \kappa \nu \epsilon \iota ~(\imath \pi \pi о s)$. Other hogies were 'Акки́, 'А入фıт'́, $\Lambda а \mu i a, ~ Г о р \gamma \omega ́, ~$ Mop $\mu 0 \lambda u ́ \kappa \eta$, ${ }^{\text {" }} \mathrm{E} \mu \pi o v \sigma a$ : see Becker's Charicles E.T. pp. 224 225. Compare the well-known passage in the Phaedo ( 77 E ) $\alpha \lambda \lambda$ '

 $\lambda$ и́кєıа.

It should be noted that the order of the words $\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ maî $\delta a s$ $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s$ is very idiomatic: the effect is almost to identify the objects compared. If $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s$ preceded $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \pi a i \delta a s$ the connection between the two would be much less close. Still more idiomatic is the
A. C.
construction in similes with $\mathbf{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ and a preposition. If it is wished to bring the objects compared into the closest possible union, $\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho(\dot{\omega} s)$ with the preposition is placed first, and the preposition itself written only once: see for example Rep. viri. 545 E ís $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi a i ̂ \delta a s ~ \dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s ~ \pi a \iota \grave{o u ́ \sigma a s ~ к a i ~ e ́ \rho \epsilon \sigma \chi \eta \lambda o u ́ \sigma a s, ~ T h e a e t . ~ 170 ~ A ~}$
 scripts however often violate the rule so far as the omission of the preposition is concerned: see Cobet, Variae Lectiones p. 165 foll.
15. $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \circ$ v̀s кaì $\theta a v a ́ \tau o v s ~ к \tau \lambda . ~ \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu o l=$ chains $)(\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha ́=$ im-
 $\tau \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \phi \alpha \iota \rho \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \epsilon s)$ adds to the rhetorical effect: the many have a variety of deaths etc., from which to choose our $\mu \circ \rho \mu \dot{\omega}$.
 $\theta \epsilon o ̀ s ~ \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \pi \epsilon \epsilon \mu \psi \eta$. The word means 'inflicting on' (Church), not of course 'threatening with'. Socrates means that cleath is only a $\mu \circ \rho \mu \dot{\omega}$, not simply in the anticipation but in the actual suffering of it. Dr Verrall suggests $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi o v \sigma a$ as if $=$ 'assuming the forms of' like the Empusa. I am not quite satisfied that $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \sigma v \sigma a$ is rightly formed, nor even allowing this does the construction seem quite natural : but I am convinced that Plato wrote $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi o v \sigma a$ rather than émıфє́povaa let us say, because the ending is identical with ${ }_{\xi} \mu \pi \pi \sigma v \sigma a$ : see my note on 47 в line 14 for more examples of the play upon words in Plato.
17. av่ $\tau \alpha=$ 'the question': see on $44 \mathrm{C} \dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma 0 \nu \tau \alpha \iota ~ a u ̉ \tau \dot{\alpha}$ oúr $\omega$ $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho \bar{z} \chi \theta a \iota$.
 $\dot{\delta} \rho \theta \hat{\omega} \epsilon \epsilon i \sigma \eta \gamma \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ ), where the first inquiry is concluded: the second point is then raised by way of protest against the first (ibid. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \delta \dot{\eta}$,
 $\mu \epsilon \nu$ has no $\epsilon i \tau a$ or $\epsilon i \tau a \delta \epsilon$ to balance it.
 is often = 'that of yours', here made clearer by ồ $\sigma \dot{v} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon$. $\dot{\alpha} \nu a \lambda a \mu-$ $\beta \alpha{ }^{2} \omega$ is 'iterum sumo'-'take up where I laid down' as in Rep. vi.
 reference is to $44 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{D}$, and 45 E .
 cf. Apol. 19 A $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \lambda \hat{\alpha} \beta \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ oûv $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s ~ \tau i s ~ \dot{\eta} \kappa a \tau \eta \gamma$ орia $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu$; In English we must say 'recur-and ask if'. The subject to $\begin{gathered} \\ \lambda \\ \epsilon \\ \gamma \\ \epsilon \tau \\ \text { o is }\end{gathered}$ $\dot{\delta} \lambda 6 \gamma o s$, to be understood from $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau o \nu$ qòv $\lambda$ brov: it is defined by the clause ö ǒ $\tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \mu \grave{̀} \nu — o u ̈$. The imperfect is used because Socrates
refers to the teaching of his whole life, see on $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \in \gamma \quad \nu$ in line 9 above. $\dot{\epsilon} к \dot{\operatorname{a}} \sigma \tau о \tau \epsilon$ means on every occasion when the subject was discussed. If there was one thing on which Socrates insisted more than any other, it was that no man's opinion is worth anything on any subject which he has not studied: see Grote Vol. vili. p. 239 foll.
 doctrine that only some $\delta o ́ \xi a \iota$ are worthy of regard was right, or (b) it was wrong, or $(c)$ it was right then and wrong now. In his statement of the third alternative Socrates substitutes the application for the statement of the general principle-was $I$ right in thinking it my duty to die then, although others thought otherwise, and am I wrong now?
 $\beta \eta$ кòs toûto áräòv $\gamma \in \gamma o \nu$ éval: and Socrates must often have said the same in declining Crito's former invitations to escape: see on 44 B

 סiкасоs Greek prefers the personal mode of expression. äpa='after all' expresses surprise and disappointment. See on Apol. 34 C є́ $\gamma \dot{\omega}$


 awkward. For ${ }^{a} \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega$ s used in this way ( $=$ 'otherwise than it ought' i.e. nearly $=\epsilon i \kappa \hat{\eta}$ temere) cf. Phaed. 76 E ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \mathrm{c}$ äl ó $\lambda$ ó $\gamma$ os oútos $\epsilon i \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu 0 s \in i \eta$, and the adverbial expression $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu a ̈ \lambda \lambda \omega s$, as in Theaet.

 frequent in the dialogues of Plato's early and middle period: in the later dialogues $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s$, oै $\nu \tau \omega s$ and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \dot{\prime} \dot{a}$ (less frequent) are more common: see Schanz in Hermes (1886) xxi. 3, pp. 439-459. As for the origin of the phrase, Schanz accepts the explanation given by Fox, according to whom $\dot{\omega}$ s is the ablative of the article, as $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s$ is of $\dot{d} \lambda \eta \theta$ és: but surely $\tau \dot{\omega} s$ and not $\dot{\omega} s$ is the ablative of ró. The old explanation (which I prefer) is to regard the phrase as parallel to $\dot{\omega} s$ $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \rho \omega s$, $\dot{\omega}$ äd $\lambda \lambda \omega$ etc., and due to attraction like $\theta a v \mu a \sigma i \omega s \dot{\omega} s: a ̈ \nu \delta \rho \epsilon s$ $\sigma \circ \phi o i \omega \dot{\omega} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s$ (Phaed. 63 A ) for example is short for $\sigma o \phi o l$ oüt $\omega$, w's ả $\lambda \eta \theta$ '́s $\epsilon$ モ̇ $\sigma \iota \nu$. Kühner's Ausführliche Grammatik II. p. 92 I.
 etc. were almost technical terms of the Socratic dialectic: see Introd. to Apol. p. xv.
25. did入otóтєpos, like $\dot{\delta}$ aútós, is in the predicate.
27. $\tau \omega ̂ \nu$ oio $\mu \dot{v} \nu \omega \nu \tau \iota \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota v$. Socrates means himself primarily: but he chooses a phrase which will include Crito too, so as to make his conclusion appear as the verdict of all right-minded men. $\lambda \epsilon \in \epsilon \iota \nu$ $\tau \iota$ ) (ovi $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \lambda \epsilon \bar{\gamma} \epsilon \iota$, 'to be right' ) ('to be wrong': so in English 'there is something in what you say'. So $\tau i \pi o \iota \epsilon i \nu=$ 'to be making something of it' in Symp. 173 A . $\hat{\phi} \delta \epsilon$ before $\dot{v} \pi \dot{o} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ oio $\mu \epsilon \dot{\nu} \omega \nu$ refers forward to ö $\tau \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta o \xi \omega \nu-\tau \dot{\alpha} s \delta \grave{\epsilon} \mu \eta^{\prime}$.
 Eng. 'that as I said just now' : see on 45 B wंs $\epsilon \gamma \dot{\omega}$ oî $\mu a l$ iкavá. $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ $\delta \dot{\eta}=\dot{\alpha} \rho \tau_{i} i \omega s$ as so often (see my note on Apol. 37 c) : Cobet would write $\nu v \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$, and Schanz now follows him: B too has $\nu v \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$ here.
 $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon v o \nu$ in Phaed. 59 E and Phaedr. 228 в) are sometimes used as aorists. See also Goodwin MT. 8.
 lines $19-20$. The principle is enunciated more precisely because upon it hinges the argument down to 48 A .
 25 C.
31. ©̋ $\sigma a \gamma \in \tau \boldsymbol{d} v \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \epsilon \epsilon a=$ 'in all human probability': for ö $\sigma \alpha \gamma \epsilon$

 Socrates believed that he would die upon the third day, but as Crito disbelieved the vision (see on 46 A) Socrates waives the point for the present. $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{a} \pi<0 \theta \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu=\dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \theta a \nu \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \theta a u$.
47 A 33. таракроv́ol. Like $\sigma \phi \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ this word is probably a metaphor from the palaestra: cf. Theaet. 168 A $\tau \dot{a} \sigma \phi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \mu \alpha \tau a$
 The original meaning may have been to give an unfair blow, hit below the belt. There is a touch of irony in oúк ä̀ $\sigma \dot{\epsilon} \pi a \rho a-$ крои́л: Socrates knew well that it was Crito and not he whose mental vision was dimmed by the coming doom (see Phaed. 84 E). I think the words are meant as a reply to Crito's taunt in
 emphatic: see note. For this reason I have printed $\sigma \dot{\epsilon}$ with an accent.
34. ov̉X ikavติs: infra oủxi $\kappa a \lambda \omega \hat{s}$ in line $3^{6}$ is stronger: cf. in 46 в the change from ö $\mu$ ooo to $\quad$ oùs aúroús: see note in loc.

suggestions which he has made on the Crito）completely misses the point．
 MSS（and the second hand in B）read oú $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ，$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda a \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ ， $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta^{\prime}$ ov̉；Apart from their slender Ms authority，the words are objectionable（ $\alpha$ ）because they correspond to nothing either in 46 c


 $\dot{\alpha} \phi \rho \delta \nu \omega \nu$ ；Plato is especially careful to avoid any premature indi－ cations of the course of an argument：he professes to follow ör $\eta$ ä̀ ó $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~ \ddot{\sigma} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \pi \nu \epsilon \cup ̂ \mu a ~ \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \eta ~(R e p . ~ I I I . ~ 394 ~ D) . ~$

## CHAPTER VII．

In this chapter Socrates recalls the familiar illustrations by which he used to enforce the doctrine that no opinion deserves to be con－ sidered except that of those who know，and applies them to the case in point．Introduction p．xii．


 spective，and $\tau o o o \hat{\tau} \tau o s$ retrospective．The imperfect $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \bar{\gamma} \epsilon \epsilon \circ$ is used because Socrates is recalling the doctrines taught throughout his life：see on $\epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \gamma \nu$ in 46 в．


 мá入ıбта кт入．

кal тоиิто $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \omega \nu=$＇and making this his work＇：hoc agens． Buttmann compares Xen．Hell．iv．8． 22 oủ ồ $\gamma$ àp $\epsilon \in \kappa \rho a ́ \tau o u v ~ a u ̀ t o u ̂ ~$
 Compare $\pi \rho \hat{\alpha} \gamma \mu \alpha=$＇profession＇in Apol． 20 C．

5．larpòs $\geqslant$ そ $\pi a i \delta o \tau \rho(\beta \eta s:$ see Gorg． 452 A foll．The latpós is there regarded as the $\delta \eta \mu$ ovp $\begin{gathered}\text { ors ivteias：the } \pi a \iota \delta o \tau \rho i \beta \eta s \text { as the }\end{gathered}$
 $\tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau a:$ and so Soph． 228 e $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \mu \grave{\nu} \nu$ al̃ $\chi$ os $\gamma v \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \eta ́, \pi \epsilon \rho \imath$
 （ 464 в foll．）iaтрıкท and $\gamma v \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ gre described as the two
branches of the art which looks after the body ( $\dot{\eta}$ тov̂ $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau o s$ əєрatєia); they are correlative ( $\dot{\alpha} v \tau i \sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi o \iota$ ) with $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \sigma \sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \eta$ ( $\delta \iota$ $\kappa \alpha \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ ) and $\nu 0 \mu \circ \theta \epsilon \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$, the two subdivisions of $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ or the art which pays attention to the soul. Plato frequently places the two professions side by side: e.g. Prot. $3^{\mathrm{I}} 3 \mathrm{D}$ モ̇à $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \iota s \tau u ́ x n \gamma v \mu$ -
 professions were united in the person of Herodicus of Selymbria:



9. $\alpha^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \eta: \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ is regular in such antitheses: see on Apo!. 23 D.
12. тav́тท—ท̂̉ ảv $\kappa \tau \lambda$. Note the position of $\tau a u ́ \tau \eta:$ it serves to throw special emphasis on the clause introduced by $\hat{\eta}$ äv.
 $\tau \hat{\xi} \nu_{\text {. In }} \dot{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon \circ \nu \bar{\gamma}$ the $\gamma \epsilon$ is added because what follows inculcates obedience to the larpós as $\gamma v \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \epsilon \in \nu$ to the $\pi a \leqslant \delta o \tau \rho i \beta \eta s$ : $x a i-\gamma \epsilon$ is frequently used in this way to introduce something which belongs to a different class from the things already enume-

 hang together, being all concerned with number or mathematics. On the food of a Greek athlete cf. Aristotle Eth. Nic. iI. i iof ${ }^{\text {a }} 36$ ff.




 tional point if it is noted that the word $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau a ́ \tau \eta s$ suggests $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \dot{\prime} \dot{\sigma} \tau a-$ $\mu a \iota$ and so leads up to $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \alpha a_{0} \nu \tau \iota$ : Socrates wishes to deduce from the example of training the general principle that only he who knows deserves to be regarded. The word $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau a ́ \tau \eta$ s is sometimes used in the sense of a trainer: cf. Xen. Mem. III. 5. 18 द́p roîs rvupıкoîs $\alpha^{\gamma} \gamma \hat{\omega} \sigma_{t}$

 $\sigma \epsilon \omega s \epsilon \pi \tau \sigma \tau a \tau \epsilon i$ (sc. $\gamma v \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \eta)$. Plato repeatedly thinks of $\epsilon \pi i$ $\sigma \tau a \mu a \iota$ when he uses the words $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{d} \tau \eta s$ or $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau a \tau \hat{\omega}$ : see for






 $\pi \rho \dot{\xi} \xi \epsilon \iota \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$. I have no doubt that Socrates thought it a real confirmation of his view that knowledge should everywhere hold rule when he found that $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\tau} \eta \mathrm{s}$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau \alpha \mu a \iota$ seem to be connected, and I think Plato hints at this in such passages as Polit.
 nothing in vain': even the similarity of names is not without its significance: hence Plato wrote the Cratylus. A precisely similar phenomenon appears in the case of the word $\epsilon \hat{\nu} \pi \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \epsilon \nu$. Just as here $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \tau \eta$ forms the transition to $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \dot{t} \frac{1}{} \nu \tau \iota$, so in Charm. 173 D

 $\epsilon \dot{u} \delta \alpha \iota \mu \circ \nu 0 \hat{\imath} \mu \epsilon \nu)$ : see also I72 A and Alcibiades I. If 6 B and compare
 $\epsilon \dot{v} \pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \grave{\nu} \nu \epsilon \dot{\delta} \delta a i \mu o \nu a$. So also in Phaed. $99 \mathrm{C} \delta \epsilon \in \nu$ (which has two meanings) forms the link between $\dot{\alpha} \gamma a \theta \dot{\partial} \nu$ and $\xi v \nu \delta \in i \nu-\kappa a l$
 should be noted that the omission of the article before $\delta \epsilon^{\prime} \nu \nu$ (as here before $\epsilon \pi$ maio $\nu \tau \iota$ ) favours my view. Similarly in Symp. 204 C, where Plato proves that $\tau \grave{\partial} \dot{\epsilon} \rho \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu_{0 \nu}$ is ка入óv by means of the middle term
 $\tau \hat{\varphi} \delta \nu \tau \iota \kappa a \lambda \grave{\nu} \nu \tau \lambda$. : the entire passage from 203 A to 204 D is full of such double meanings and constructions. See also Symp. 196 c. This sort of chain-inference (incorrectly called Sorites) was afterwards very popular in the Stoic school : see Reid on Cic. Acad. Pr. 49.

I have insisted on this point partly because the editors have ignored it and partly on account of the light it throws on the meaning of the vision in 44 B : Socrates was greatly influenced by similarity of name.

It should be noted that $\epsilon \pi \alpha i \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ is a favourite word of Plato's, but less common in other authors. Protagoras used the word frequently: according to Kock on Arist. Nubes 650 it was prohably an importation from the Ionian philosophical schools into the sophistic and philosophical circles of Athens.
17. $\epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ was pronounced $\epsilon \hat{\epsilon} v \nu$ with intervocalic aspiration as in $\tau \alpha \omega \mathrm{s}$ : the derivation is doubtful, but it can hardly come from $\epsilon l \mu i$ :
see on Apol. 18 E. Possibly it is connected with eia: for as Timaeus s. v. says, it is not only $\sigma v \gamma \kappa a \tau \alpha ́ \theta \epsilon \sigma \iota \varsigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \in i \rho \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$, but also $\sigma u \nu a \not \dot{\eta}_{\eta}$ $\pi \rho o ̀ s \tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \lambda$ ovva: whence Suidas explains it as $=a ̈ \gamma \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta}$. Here for example it leads up to $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \theta \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma a s \quad \delta \grave{~} \kappa \tau \lambda$. : cf. Symp. 204 C $\epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$,


 all the best mss. The difficulties felt with regard to the text arise from a misapprehension of the argument. Socrates is gradually passing from the illustration to the case which it was intended to illustrate. Hence at first when he is only elucidating the illustration he introduces more detail: supra 47 B $\phi$ o $\beta \in i ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota$ Х $\rho \grave{\eta} \tau$ oùs $\psi$ b $\gamma$ ous каì $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \alpha ́ \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ тойs $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha i \bar{\nu}$ ous: as the application draws near there is somewhat less detail ( $\dot{\alpha} \tau \mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma a s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \delta o ́ \xi a \nu$ каì $\tau 0 \dot{v} s ~ \dot{\epsilon} \pi a i$ $\nu o u s)$ : when we are on the verge of the application, there is only
 which all this was meant to illustrate, viz. that Crito and his friends and Socrates himself are cowards in leaving Socrates to die. Schanz brackets and Kral omits кai тoùs éraivous: the other editors rightly retain the words. Ziwsa in the Zeitschr. f. d. öst. Gymn. 1879 p. 106
廿órovs, $\tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma a s \delta_{\epsilon}$ roùs $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \pi a i \nu o v s$.
 like 46 в $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu \grave{d}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$.
25. oủkov̂v кaì $\tau$ đ̈ $\lambda \lambda \alpha$-oűt $\omega \mathrm{s}$ : "verbo omisso, ut Lach. 181 A

26. kai $\delta \eta$ kai is used to introduce a climax, or (as here) the crowning point of the reasoning-the application: see on Apol. 26 D.
27. $\delta<\kappa a i \omega v$ кal $\alpha^{\prime} \delta i \kappa \omega v$ : Cron draws attention to the chiastic arrangement :

 छ̇ย́ $\mu \pi \alpha \sigma \iota ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ a ̉ \lambda \lambda o \iota s . ~$
 $\mu \in \theta a$. $\epsilon i \mu \eta^{\prime}$ with fut. ind. is more vivid and impassioned than $\eta^{\eta} \nu \mu \dot{\eta}$ with aor. conj. $\lambda \omega \beta \hat{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$ is to add insult to injury. é $\kappa \in i ̂ \nu o$ is



 (and truth is seen by $\nu$ oûs, cf. Rep. Vi. 508 C--D and Symp. 212 A ). Observe that the doctrine of the duality of soul and body is implied throughout the whole of this passage: it is one of the most distinctive traits of Plato's teaching, as it was of his master's: see Phaed. $79 \mathrm{C}, 82 \mathrm{E}$ (the soul investigates things by looking out of the prison-house of the body). To Plato the body is but the öpravov


 $\hat{\eta}$ ठià $\tau 0 u ́ \tau \omega \nu$ oiov ó $\rho \gamma \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega \nu$ aí $\theta a \nu o ́ \mu \in \theta a$ ö $\sigma a$ ai $\sigma \theta \eta \tau a ́$ : compare also Rep. v. 469 E, where those who wreak their vengeance on the dead bodies of their enemies are likened to hounds aî roîs $\lambda i \theta o u s$ ois à $\nu$

 right, and disabled by wrong' (Church): see last note. For this
 $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota a \kappa \tau \lambda$. Goodwin MT. 8. The use of $\hat{\eta} \nu=$ ' is ex hypothesi' does not differ greatly from this.

## CHAPTER VIII.

Here Socrates finally disposes of the first point raised by Crito, viz. that we should regard the opinions of the many, and proceeds to discuss the second (see above, 44 D )-that the many can take away our lives.
 'causing disease', 'unwholesome', )( vं $\gamma \iota \epsilon \iota$ óv: so in Theaet. 171 E

 of $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ : Plato has arranged his words so as to express the double meaning of $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \epsilon \bullet \Theta \dot{\rho} \mu \in \nu 0 \iota \tau \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi a \ddot{\partial} \partial \tau \tau \omega \nu \delta \delta \xi \xi \eta$, and $\pi \epsilon \bullet \theta \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \iota \tau \hat{\eta}$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \grave{\eta} \kappa \tau \lambda$., for the text at once suggests $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha i \ddot{\sigma} \nu \tau \omega \nu$. Compare Legg. II. 67 I D $\nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \phi \quad \nu \tau a s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \mu \grave{\eta} ~ \nu \eta \phi o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu ~ a \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o u ́ s, ~$
 $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \theta o \rho u ́ \beta \omega \nu$ sc. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \not \partial \nu \tau \omega \nu \nu \eta \phi o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$. Hirschig foolishly corrupts the text to $\pi \epsilon \iota \theta$ ó $\mu \epsilon \nu 0 \iota \tau \hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \grave{\eta}$ €ं $\pi a \ddot{̈} \nu \nu \tau \omega \nu \delta o ́ \xi \eta$.
6. тоиิто тò $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha$. тоиิтo is of course in the predicate: Wohl- 47 E rab is wrong in reading roûto $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ with Buttmann; for $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ without
the article is 'body' generally, i.e. 'matter', not 'the body': cf.


8. $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu 0 x$ 0ךpov̂. The preposition $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ is far more frequent than oúv in Plato, as in Attic Greek generally (except Xenophon):
 originally 'afflicted' (as here), then 'depraved', 'corrupt', for toios
 $\dot{\alpha}: \delta \rho \omega \hat{\nu} \tau \epsilon \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon$ (Hom. Od. xviil. 136-137). So also Ar. Av.

 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \pi$ o $\nu \eta \rho o i \quad \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \epsilon s$, and Hesiod Frag. 95. I (ed. Göttling) $\pi 0 \nu \eta$ pótator кai גiplotov (of Heracles). It is we and not the Greeks who by suffering are made strong. Cf. Simonides Frag. 5. 10-13 ed. Bergk.
10. ov̉ $\delta a \mu$ ŵs. Plato held that it is better to die than to suffer incurable disease: Gorg. 512 A -a passage which is parallel to this both in respect of the illustration and the application- $\epsilon i \mu \epsilon \in \nu \tau$

 the "meditative skipper". The whole subject is discussed in Rep. III. 405 foll. The presence of too many doctors, says Plato, proves that a city is physically unsound just as a plethora of $\delta<\kappa a \sigma \tau a l$ proves that it is unsound morally: ibid. 410 A it is prescribed that doctors


 ávıátous ávooi á $\pi$ октє $\nu 0 \hat{v} \sigma \iota \nu$. This is declared to be the most merciful way of treating the patients themselves and the best thing for the State. Herodicus is censured as $\mu а к \rho o ̀ \nu-\tau o ̀ \nu ~ \theta a ́ v a \tau o \nu ~ a u ́ \tau \hat{~}$ moiń $\sigma a s(406 \mathrm{~B})$, because he prolonged his life by a course of
 $\kappa \dot{z} \mu \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ ia $a \rho \in \cup \nu \mu \notin \nu \varphi(i b .406 \mathrm{C}$ ).
 leian : the editors mostly follow less good mss and read $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$-ápa. The $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ introduces a fresh point in the argument: cf. Apol. 37 C
 $\hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ' $\hat{u} \rho a$ ( $\hat{\alpha}, \rho a$ in this connection generally invites the answer 'no')


 $\dot{\alpha} \rho \alpha$ is separated from $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ in order to let the full stress of the sentence-accent fall on $\mu \epsilon \tau^{\prime}$ '́кєivov, which introduces the application.
 cusative after $\lambda \omega \beta \dot{a} \sigma \theta a l$ : the dative is here preferred in order to avoid the appearance of ambiguity. Ar. Eq. $1408 \ell^{\prime} \nu{ }^{\prime}$ ' $\delta \omega \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ aúrò $\nu$ ois $\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \omega \beta \hat{a} \theta^{\prime}$ oi $\xi \in \nu 0$. The verb of kindred meaning $\lambda \nu \mu \alpha i \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a l-$ not found in Plato-may also be construed with a dative as well as with an accusative.

 $\tau 0 \hat{v} \theta \epsilon \mathfrak{l o v} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \chi \epsilon \iota \kappa \tau \lambda$. and Prot. 313 A ô $\delta \epsilon \frac{\pi}{\pi} \epsilon \rho i \pi \lambda \epsilon$ iovos $\tau 0 \hat{v}$
 $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \epsilon \nu, \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau о \hat{v} \hat{\eta} \pi$ торךрои̂ $\gamma \epsilon \nu 0 \mu$ évov кт入. Socrates never wearied of asserting the dignity of the soul.
 scribed as a disease of the soul: $\tau i$ oviv; $\hat{\eta}^{\nu} \delta^{\prime} \notin \gamma \omega^{\cdot} \psi v \chi \hat{\eta}$ äpa ov̉к
 $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa l a \quad \tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha i \dot{a} \kappa о \lambda \alpha \sigma \mathfrak{l} \alpha \kappa i \quad \delta \epsilon \iota \lambda i a \kappa \alpha i \dot{a} \mu a \theta i a$.
 this more probable than to take ov $\pi a ́ \nu v$ together: $\pi a ́ v v$ seems too emphatic to admit of this interpretation.
 right, as the Greeks probably considered ő $\tau \iota$ and ${ }_{\circ} \circ \tau \iota$ to be the same word (=quod) : see my Apology p. 123.
22. $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau 0 \nu \mu \epsilon ́ v$ instead of being followed by $\epsilon i \tau a$ or $\begin{gathered}\pi \epsilon \epsilon \iota \tau a(\delta \epsilon)\end{gathered}$ corresponds to $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$ in line 25 below : the second argument of Crito is quoted as an objection to Socrates' refutation of the first: see on $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu \mu e ́ v$ in 46 c .
 means to introduce a subject or a proposal in a formal way: see

 $\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta 0 \hat{\sigma} \sigma a \nu$ av่ $\eta \tau \rho i \delta a \quad \chi a i \rho \epsilon \iota \nu$ ย่ầ $\kappa \tau \lambda$. Perhaps Plato chooses the word in order to suggest that Crito as it were $\epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \delta i \kappa \eta \nu \kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \omega \bar{\omega}$ $\nu \dot{\mu} \mu \omega \nu$-the Laws being on their defence: see Introd. pp. vii-xi.
25. $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{̀} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$ : here begins Socrates' reply to the second point raised by Crito: see above 44 D. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}=$ 'for that matter',


 III. 409 в.
26. ȧтоктเขvúval is preferred by Plato to $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \kappa \tau \epsilon i \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$.
27. $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \alpha$ 该 кai $\tau a \hat{v} \tau \alpha \kappa \tau \lambda$. = 'of course, that is also evident: yes, Socrates, he will say so'. If the text is right, I think $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a$ o $\dot{\eta}$ кal $\tau a \hat{\tau} \tau a$ is an aside : the answer to Socrates' remark is contained in $\phi$ ai $\eta$ rà $\rho a \not \nu$. Crito (who is not yet convinced by Socrates' reasoning) first declares that the power of the many to put one to death ( $\tau a \hat{v} \tau a$ ) is as obvious as the necessity of regarding what they think of one (каi): he then assents to Socrates' remark. See above
 $\kappa \tau \lambda$.

With Cron and Kral I have retained the vulgate, because I think it presents the fewest difficulties. Wohlrab gives $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \alpha \quad \delta \dot{\eta} \kappa a i$ $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau a$ to Socrates, фaiŋ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu, \dot{\omega} \Sigma \omega \omega \kappa \rho a \tau \epsilon s$ to Crito, and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta}$ $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota s$ to Socrates: Schanz brackets фain $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \stackrel{a}{u} v$, and gives both $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a$ or̀ каi тâ̂ta and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon s$ to Crito: Göbel prints " $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a$
 think the text is probably right as it stands: but if not, I should
 taking $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a \alpha \dot{\eta}$ as an adverb as it is in the MSS ( $\delta \eta \lambda a \delta \hat{\eta})$.

## 

ovitós $\tau \epsilon: \tau \epsilon$ corresponds to каí in каì тóvסє av̉ бкóтєє line 3 r . There is virtually an anacoluthon, since oùtós $\tau \epsilon$ ó $\lambda$ ó
 ou тò $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$.: but whether the second principle is still binding or not, has not yet been decided: whence каі тóv $\delta \epsilon$ аи̃ бко́тєє ктл.
 but as $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho_{o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu}$ for $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \circ \tau \epsilon \in \rho \psi$ or $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho \dot{\sigma} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu \in i \rho \eta \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \omega$ is, to say the least of it, unusual, and the кai is awkward, I follow Wex, Madvig and recent editors (except Göbel) in reading каi $\pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu$. ö $\mu$ otos каì $\pi \rho о ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu=$ similis quam antea: see above 46 в $\sigma \chi \in \delta o ́ \nu$
 $\pi \rho о ́ т є \rho о у$.
 held this view during the trial : see Apol. 28 в and ch. xxiri. Com-




necessary because $\epsilon \mathfrak{v} \zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$ has a double meaning（see above on 47 B $\tau \hat{\varphi} \epsilon \in \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta$ кaì $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \hat{o} o \nu \tau \iota)$ ：it is necessary also to identify $\epsilon \hat{v}$ with סıкalws because the next chapter opens with the question $\pi \dot{\sigma} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \boldsymbol{\nu}$


It should be noted that qaủtó̀ $\tau 0 \sigma o \hat{\tau o \nu}$ тoloûtov $\tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa o \hat{\tau} \frac{\nu}{\nu}$ are regular in Plato，not $\tau$ aútó and the like ：see on Apol．${ }_{2} 4 \mathrm{C}$ ．Schanz now thinks it probable that Plato always used the forms in $-\nu$ ：see his Preface to the Laws p．vi．

## CHAPTER IX．

This and the following chapter make a kind of interlude．Socrates

 Laws to prove that if Socrates made his escape he would violate this principle，Socrates pauses to emphasize the full force and meaning of this $\lambda$ óros，and the irrelevancy of every other．Throughout this and the following chapters it must be borne in mind that Socrates identified $\tau o ̀ ~ \delta i к \alpha \iota o \nu ~ w i t h ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \nu o ́ \mu ~ ц \mu o \nu: ~ s e e ~ I n t r o d . ~ p . ~ x i i i . ~$
 like（Graser quoted by Wohlrab）．See above on ö $\pi \epsilon \rho \lambda \notin \hat{\gamma} \omega$ in 45 в．


2．то́тєроข Síkalov ктл．Síkalov is＇right＇：see on 45 C above． Crito had put the question on the same grounds in the passage re－
 is not＇to permit＇（ $̇ \phi(t \in \nu a l)$ ，but＇to let go free＇，as in Apol． 29 C $\dot{\alpha} \phi i \in \mu \hat{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu \sigma \epsilon$ ．

4．$\eta$ グ ov̉ Síkatov：more emphatic and clear than $\eta$ ぞ oủ：so in в $4^{8} \mathrm{C}$ above $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \geqslant \hat{\eta}$ ov̉ $\mu \in ̇ \nu \epsilon \iota$ ．
 clause is placed first so as to let emphasis be thrown on $\sigma \dot{v})\left(\epsilon^{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}\right.$ ： ai $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \in \psi \epsilon t s a ̈ s \sigma \dot{v} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon s$ would be much less pointed．Cron remarks that when the antecedent is adopted into the relative clause，the article is more usually omitted，as in oús $\dot{\eta}$ $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota s ~ \nu o \mu i \zeta \epsilon \iota ~ \theta \epsilon o u ̀ s ~ o u ̉ ~$ $\nu o \mu i \zeta \omega \nu$ ．Tr．＇as for the considerations you mention，about＇etc．

8．$\dot{\omega} s \hat{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$ ：see on 46 D above．
9．$\sigma \kappa \epsilon \in \mu \mu a \tau \alpha \mathfrak{\eta}$ ．$\sigma \kappa \bar{\epsilon} \mu \mu \alpha \tau a$ is of course in the predicate．The


кai $\pi a l \delta \omega \nu \tau \rho \circ \phi \hat{\eta} s$ ．On $\mu \eta^{\prime} \hat{\eta}$（ $=$ nescio an sit）see Goodwin MT． 83 ： probably some word expressing fear or apprehension ought to be


 $\tau \hat{\eta} \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \dot{\partial} \nu \tau \iota \nu 0 \hat{v} \nu a ̈ \nu$ ö $\tau \iota \tau u ́ \chi o \iota \tau \tau \hat{v} \tau 0 \pi \alpha \theta \in \hat{\imath} \nu$ ．We are of course not justified in seeing here an allusion to the alleged remorse of the Athenians after Socrates＇death：the tradition about their repentance is late and untrustworthy：see Grote，Vol．Viil．p．302．For äy with the participle in apodosis cf．Legg．vi．781 A $\pi 0 \lambda \grave{v} a ̈ \mu \epsilon \iota \nu \circ \nu$ äy
 $\sigma \kappa \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ more often means＇to come to life again＇：for the causative sense cf．Phaed． 89 в є́áv $\pi \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon-\mu \eta \eta^{\prime} \delta \nu \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ av̉ròv $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \beta \iota \omega ் \sigma a-$ $\sigma \theta a \iota$ ．


 generally occurs in religious uses like Legg．III． 682 A $\xi$ ǵ $\nu \tau \iota \sigma \iota \mathrm{X}$ ápıo каi Mov́бaıs，or where the connection is a very close one，as in Legg．

 $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota$ ：see also note on $\mu \epsilon \tau$ á in 47 E．
$\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau} \tau \omega \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\nu} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda} \hat{\nu} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ ：ô̂тos like the Latin iste expresses contempt． Note in the next sentence the emphatic place assigned to $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{i} \nu)($ roîs $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda o i ̂ s$.
 phrase in Plato：see Parm． 141 D $̈$ és $\gamma \epsilon \dot{o}$ 入ó $\gamma o s$ aipeí．Sometimes the object is expressed as in Rep．x． 607 в ó $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ 入óros $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} s$ ク̋p $\rho \iota$ ． Near akin is the use of aipeip＝＇to secure a conviction＇，as in Apol．


12．vพิv $\delta \eta$ ．See on 46 D above．
14．kal Xápicas：the plural is preferred to the singular，not only because Socrates is speaking for Crito as well as for himself， but because it balances the plural $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ more neatly．It is hardly necessary to supply $\epsilon i \delta \partial o ́ \tau \epsilon s$ from $\tau \epsilon \lambda 0 \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ：$\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \nu \chi$ Хápı（ $\chi$ ápı $\tau a s$ ）is to＇pay a debt of gratitude＇．
 be more logical and less grammatical．


$\mu \dot{\eta}$ ब's $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega}$ - $\eta$ in 48 C . $\dot{v} \pi 0 \lambda o \gamma i \xi \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$ is 'to entertain a reflection pointing to the opposite line of conduct from that which we are, or ought to be, pursuing' : see on Apol. 28 B. We have the same sentiment and the same mode of expression in Apol. 28 D $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}-\mu \hat{\epsilon}-$

 'staying here' from 'standing fast ' or 'holding our ground'.
 Schanz reads oú $\tau^{\prime} \epsilon i$ after Forster. $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon i$ is to be supplied from the preceding clause.

 ढ̈ть $\check{\omega} \rho a, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \beta \epsilon \beta o v \lambda \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma a \iota$. $\delta \rho \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ is the deliberative conjunctive.
24. тav̂бal. In Attic 'stop!' is $\pi a \hat{v} \sigma a \iota ~ o r ~ \pi a \hat{v} \epsilon ~(n o t ~ \pi a v ́ o v, ~ 48 ~ E ~$ though in Homer $\pi a v \in \epsilon$ is found). $\pi a \hat{v} \epsilon$ is the only form of this word used intransitively in good writers: the plural is $\pi a v \in \sigma \theta \epsilon$ and $\pi a v ́ \sigma a \sigma \theta \epsilon$ : see Cobet V. L. pp. 264, 367, and Rutherford on Babrius 28. 8.

 for apart from the awkwardness of $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} a^{\prime} \kappa о \nu \tau о s, \tau a \hat{v} \tau \alpha \pi \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ could only mean 'to let me remain and die': an impossible meaning, since it leaves rav̂ra without an antecedent, Socrates as yet professing not to have made up his mind but to be willing to follow $\delta \pi \eta$
 Meiser (Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 187+. p. 40) in transposing тâ̂̃a $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota$, and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \kappa о \nu \tau o s ~(s c . ~ \sigma о \hat{u}): ~ \tau а \hat{v} \tau \alpha ~ \pi \rho \alpha ́ ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu ~(=' t o ~ d o ~ w h a t ~ I ~ d o ', ~$ 'to act herein') depends on $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \pi$ то入入où $\pi o \iota o v ̂ \mu a \iota$, and is coordinate with and not subordinate to $\pi \in i=\alpha u$, which is used absolutely. Translate: 'for I think it important to persuade you, and not to act in this without your consent'. Cron, Schanz and Kral retain the ms order, changing $\pi \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma a \iota$ to $\pi \epsilon i \sigma a s$, with Buttmann, Hermann and Madvig: Wohlrab alone among recent editors retains the mS reading. By Wex (Fleckeisen's Jahrb. for 1856 , p. 669) $\pi \in \hat{\epsilon} \sigma a \iota$ is rejected as "ein erklärendes Glossem zu dem falsch verstandenem
 $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \dot{\eta}$ äкоעтоs sc. $\pi \rho \hat{a} \tau \tau \epsilon$ '". Göbel discusses the passage at length in his Fulda program 1882 p. 10 foll., and claims to have solved all difficulties by the change of $\pi \in i \hat{\sigma} a \iota ~$ to $\pi a \hat{\sigma} \sigma a \iota$ : but in reality this is
only mending one fault by two others, for (a) $\pi \alpha \hat{\jmath} \sigma \alpha \iota$ would inevitably lead to ${ }^{\alpha} \kappa о \nu \tau \alpha$ : (b) $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu$ ' is not 'aber nicht', but 'nicht '; i.e. it must introduce not a mere qualification, but a direct antithesis to some word in the preceding clause: and $\pi \epsilon i \sigma a \iota$ (or $\pi \epsilon i \sigma a s$ ) is exactly such a word. The choice clearly lies between Meiser's view and that of Cron: I prefer the former, because (a) even if $\pi$ eí $\sigma$ as were right I think Plato would either have written $\pi \epsilon \rho i \pi \pi \lambda \lambda o \hat{v} \pi o \iota o \hat{\mu} \mu \iota$ $\pi \epsilon i \sigma a s ~ \sigma \epsilon$, à $\lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \kappa о \nu \tau o s, \tau a \hat{v} \tau \alpha \quad \pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$, or (less likely) $\pi \epsilon \rho \imath$
 (b) because in tâ̂ta $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu=$ 'do what I am doing', 'act in this matter', the force of rav̂ra seems to me more obscure if it follows $\sigma \epsilon$ than if it follows a"коутоs.
 (with Wohlrab) Rep. IV. 432 C öpa oûv кaì $\pi \rho \circ \theta \nu \mu o \hat{v} \kappa a \tau i \delta \epsilon i ̀ \nu ~ \epsilon ̇ \alpha ́ \nu$
 (a meaning it never bears), but 'si forte', 'in case' : in such expressions there is no real ellipse of the apodosis : see Monro's Homeric Grammar, p. 212.
$\tau \boldsymbol{\eta} v \alpha^{\alpha} \rho \times \eta$ ท $v$ is 'the outset', 'the start ': from its use in such examples as the present it came to mean 'principle', as so often in Aristotle.
49 A 29. ท̂ ${ }^{2} v \mu_{\alpha} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ oln $n$, i.e. in the way to which your opinion most inclines: $\hat{\eta}$ is adverbial and goes with olly, as in ol' $\epsilon \theta \theta a \iota$ taút $\eta$ : ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi \chi \iota \nu$ is not to be understood.

## CHAPTER X.

In this chapter Crito is made to admit (a) that it is wrong to requite wrong with wrong or evil with evil, and (b) that it is our duty to carry out in practice that which we have in theory admitted to be right. Introduction p. xii.

 $\delta \iota \omega \kappa \tau \epsilon \in о \nu \kappa \alpha i \dot{a} \sigma \kappa \eta \tau \epsilon \in о \nu \kappa \tau \lambda$., and for the sentiment itself Apol.
 $\sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$ : Gorg. 469 B $\mu \epsilon \in \gamma \iota \sigma \tau 0 \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu \tau v \gamma \chi \alpha ́ \nu \epsilon \epsilon$ ồ $\tau \dot{\partial} \dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon i \nu \nu$ : and Rep. I. 335 D.

phatic: see on Apol. 26 c ( $\epsilon i \nu a \iota \tau \iota \nu \grave{s} s \theta o u ́ s$ ), where I refer to
 $\tau \eta \theta \in i$ s.


 and others whether the doctrine here maintained was ever held by the historical Socrates : but I have no doubt that it was. In harmony with his egoistic principles, Socrates denied that it is ever right to wrong another, because wrongdoing has an injurious influence on one's own soul: see Introd. p. xii.
 $\eta \pi \hat{a} \sigma a l$ : but as there is nothing to which the words can be referred, I agree with recent editors in omitting them. The alternative



7. ékкєХuréval. The metaphor (as Göbel remarks) is probably from losing or throwing goods overboard at sea: cf. Rep. viII. 553 в


 ठ́v́vaual $\nu \hat{v} \nu \dot{\nu} \kappa \kappa \beta a \lambda \epsilon i ้ \nu$.
8. $\pi a ́ \lambda a l-a ̈ p a . ~ \pi a ́ \lambda \alpha l ~ g o e s ~ w i t h ~ e ̀ \lambda a ́ \theta o \mu \epsilon \nu-\delta \iota a \phi \epsilon ́ p o \nu \tau \epsilon s: ~ a ̈ p a ~$
 тои́т $\omega \nu$ поıท̆ $\sigma \omega$;
$\tau \eta \lambda \iota к o l \delta \epsilon$. After $\tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa o l \delta \epsilon$ the mss read $\gamma \epsilon \rho о \nu \tau \epsilon s{ }^{\prime} \nu \delta \rho \epsilon$ : I think with Cron and Schanz that $\gamma^{\epsilon} \rho o \nu \tau \epsilon s$ is a gloss on $\tau \eta \lambda c \kappa o i \delta \epsilon$. Fischer and Wohlrab defend the word on the ground that $\gamma \in \rho \rho 0 \nu \tau \epsilon s \not \partial \nu \delta \rho \epsilon s$ makes a good antithesis to $\pi a l \delta \omega \nu$ : but the phrase $\gamma \epsilon \epsilon \rho 0 \nu \tau \epsilon s{ }_{\alpha} \nu \nu \delta \rho \epsilon s$ is a trifle awkward, and $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \epsilon s$ alone seems to me more forcible as the opposite of $\pi a l \delta \omega \nu$.
9. $\sigma \pi o v \delta \hat{\eta}$ is emphatic, nearly $=\sigma \pi o v \delta \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ oủ $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \iota \hat{̣}$ (suggested by $\pi a l \delta \omega \nu$ in the next line).
 Wohlrab remarks: compare Theaet. $177 \mathrm{~B} \dot{\eta}$ คं $\eta \tau о \rho \iota к \grave{\eta}$ éкєív $\pi \omega \mathrm{s}$

 and indeed generally $\delta \alpha \phi \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \nu$ means 'to be better than' and not simply 'to differ'.
A. C.
11. $\pi a v \tau o ̀ s ~ \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o v=$ 'assuredly' (i.e. more than anything) is frequent in Plato, e.g. Prot. $34+$ B $\pi a \nu \tau o ̀ s ~ \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ è $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi$ ós є̇ $\sigma \tau$.
12. बit $\epsilon$ фaciv oi $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda$ ol $\epsilon i \tau \epsilon \mu \eta$. For the form of the sentence

 explanatory clause : see on Apol. 22 A. I have printed a colon before eitce $\phi$ afiv, cf. Apol. 1. c. $\delta \mu \omega \mathrm{s}$ in line I 4 thus becomes more easy and natural.


14. Tó $\gamma \in$ dं $\delta$ เкєiv: see on 49 A , line 3 .

кal кakд̀v кail aioxpóv. In Gorg. 474 C foll. it is shewn that
 metry throughout this speech of Socrates: it begins with ovioevi $\tau \rho \dot{\sigma} \pi \varphi$ and ends with $\pi a \nu \tau i \tau \rho \dot{\sigma} \pi \varphi$ : and the two alternatives are presented in such a way that the one which finally prevails is placed both first and last: the order is a.b.a.b.a.
19. oưठè didıкoípevov äpa divtadıкєiv: äpa is of course 'there-
 in this assume that he has been wronged by the laws: only by men: see on 54 C.
ws oi $\pi$ o $\lambda \lambda$ ol olovtal. The ordinary Greek view is well summed




 declares that this was the prevailing morality in Greece: Mem. 11. 3.

 is against the supposition that this view commended itself to him, and even Pittacus, if we may trust Diogenes Laertius (1. 4. 78), had already declared against it in the memorable words $\phi i \lambda o \nu ~ \mu \grave{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \omega \nu$ $\kappa а \kappa \hat{\omega} s, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \in \chi \theta \rho \sigma \nu$. See Introd. p. xii.
49 C 22. $\tau \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta}=$ 'once more' introduces a new departure : with $\tau i \delta \epsilon$; (infra line ${ }^{24}$ ) the departure is less new: from dंồreiv to
 котрүєiv.
23. ov̉ $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \delta \dot{1} \pi \pi 0 v$ : contrast this with ov́ $\phi$ alverac in 21 : here at
least Crito can answer without hesitation，for кakoup $\gamma \in i v$ suggests the idea of a criminal or malefactor：see L．and S．s．v．

27．тò үáp тоu какติs тоtєî̀ кт．．In Rep．I． 335 в foll． d́סıкєì is identified with какод̀s moteìv rather than каки̂s поєєiv through the middle term $\beta \lambda \alpha \pi \tau \epsilon \tau \nu$ ．


 Polit． 297 B oủk à $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os o $\dot{\nu} \delta^{\prime} \dot{\omega} \nu \tau \iota \nu \omega \nu \circ \hat{v} \nu$ ．The subject to $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \eta$ is understood from the unexpressed subject to $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a \delta \iota \kappa \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ and как $\omega$ s


32．$\kappa \alpha \theta_{0} \mu \circ \lambda_{0} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\omega} \boldsymbol{v}$ ：the кат $\alpha$ points to the gradual piecemeal character of the admissions：cf．Gorg． 499 в $\pi$ ádaı toi $\sigma o v a \dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \mu a \iota$

 where it is said that Socrates leads one on little by little till lo！ when at the end all the little admissions are added up $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \alpha$ $\tau \grave{\delta}$ $\sigma \phi a ́ \lambda \mu a$ каl द̀vavtiò $\tau$ oîs $\pi \rho \omega ́ t o l s$.
 doctrines are for the few and not for the many is more in the vein of Plato than of Socrates．It is possible that Socrates may have been led to hold this language by his condemnation on an unjust charge： but while actively engaged on his mission he was as far as possible from despairing，as is clear from Xen．Mem．iII．5．See Intro－ duction p．xv．


 ஸ́s oủk єiठठбル


36．$\alpha \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega v$ катaфpovєiv：the many laugh at the philosopher （Rep．vir． 517 A ），and if the philosopher laughs at them，$\dot{\eta} \tau \tau o \nu a ̈ \nu$
 $\psi \cup \chi \hat{\imath}):$ Rep．ViI． 518 в．

38．кoเv $\omega \boldsymbol{v \epsilon i s}$ is used with reference to кoıvウ̀ $\beta$ oulń in 38 ：so infra in $4^{2}$ ．$\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \epsilon \hat{\theta} \theta \epsilon \nu$ in the same line $=\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ roúrov toû $\lambda$ órou and is explained by $\omega$ s oúd́étoтє кт入．：compare（with Jacobs）Prot．



40．oútє тoû àvtaסtkєîv．After these words we might expect

оӥтє то仑̂ какоирүєiv, but as Göbel points out áốceív has already been identified with какоир $\bar{\epsilon} i \boldsymbol{\nu}$ (in C above, line 27 ): and besides it is on the injustice of $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \kappa \alpha \kappa о \nu \rho \gamma \epsilon \hat{\nu}$ rather than of $\tau \delta$ какоир $\gamma \in i \nu \nu$ that the rest of the dialogue turns.
49 E 42. $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \alpha \rho \chi \hat{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{s}$ : said with reference to $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \dot{\omega} \mu \in \theta \alpha$ in 28 : see note on 48 E above.
44. Tò $\mu \in \tau \alpha$ тoûto = 'my next point': see on Apol. 39 B.
48. $\mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \frac{1}{} \delta^{\prime}$ ' $\epsilon \rho \omega \tau \hat{\omega}=$ vel potius interrogo: Socrates said his say by questions oftener than by answers: see Apol. 33 B. For $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \delta \epsilon ́$ see above on 46 A.
50. $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi a \pi a \tau \eta \tau \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\sigma} v:$ to believe a theory and yet not carry it into practice is a living lie: to Socrates this seemed not only wrong, but
 Introd. to Apol. p. xi.

## CHAPTER XI.

With this chapter the third division of the dialogue begins. Crito has now admitted the major premise which is to determine the action of Socrates, viz. that under no circumstances is it right to do wrong or requite wrong with wrong or evil with evil. The minor premise is still wanting, and to establish this Socrates introduces the Laws of Athens, who endeavour to prove that if he complied with Crito's invitation, Socrates would be guilty of wrongdoing, and retaliation in wrong-doing. In this chapter they urge that escape would be wrong because it would mean the entire negation of the State and civic life. See Introduction pp. x-xiv.
I. 'Ek $\tau 0 \boldsymbol{v} \tau \omega \nu=$ 'in the light of this', 'starting from these premises' : so in 48 в $\bar{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\nu} \mu 0 \lambda о \gamma 0 \nu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu$.


 to ois= roúrocs ä: for a similar case see Apol. 37 B àvti toútou $\delta \grave{\eta}$
 оіठ' ӧть кака̀ oैрта.
6. ov̉k ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi \omega$-ov̉ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ évvow: the words are full of pathos: Crito sees but too clearly what the conclusion will be.
8. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\top} \hat{\varphi} \hat{\delta} \delta \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma$ órtє : $\hat{\psi} \delta \epsilon$ and not $\hat{\omega} \delta \epsilon$ is the reading of B. It is characteristic of Socrates to let the Laws speak for themselves:
like Plato he was nothing if not clear and emphatic．For a similar example see Theaet． 166 A foll．I think too that Plato wished to save Socrates from the charge of selfishness and lack of feeling， when his friends were so deeply moved，and hence the fatal argument comes not from his mouth but from the Laws．



9．$\epsilon \ell \theta^{\prime}$ ö $\pi \omega$ s $\delta \epsilon \hat{i}$ òvopá⿱㇒木几 $\tau 0 i ̂ \tau 0 . ~ \dot{\alpha} \pi о \delta \iota \delta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ suggests a runaway slave or a deserter，and these words are added to spare Crito＇s feelings，＂mitigandae orationis causa＂（Stallbaum）．For the Greek Stallbaum compares Legg．I． 633 A $\pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \hat{\eta} s \not{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \eta s$ $\dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} s \epsilon \ddot{i} \tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon i ̈ \tau \epsilon \dot{a} \tau \tau^{\prime} a \dot{u} \tau \dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha \lambda \in \hat{\imath} \nu \chi \rho \epsilon \dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \tau$ ．


 wards．The editors refer to Prot． $319 \mathrm{D} \tau \dot{\delta} \kappa 0 \iota \nu \grave{\nu} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ oüt $\omega$ s é $\neq \epsilon$ and Cic．Verr．II．2．II4 a communi Siciliae．It is possible that Cicero had the whole passage in view when he wrote （Cat．I．17）Quae（sc．patria）tecum Catilina sic agit et quodam modo tacita loquitur．

If．èmıбđávtes is regularly used of a vision＇standing over＇ one：see Symp．192 D（quoted on line 8 above）．The word occurs naturally to Socrates，who had a devout belief in visions：see on
 ad caput adstitit．

12．${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda 0 \tau \iota \eta^{\prime \prime}=$ aliudne quid quam？i．e．nonne？see on Apol． 24 C：${ }^{d} \lambda \lambda o \tau \iota$ alone can bear the same meaning．With $\Psi \in \dot{\psi} \pi \iota \iota \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \epsilon i s$ contrast 45 С $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \chi \in \iota \rho \in \hat{\imath} \nu \pi \rho \hat{\gamma} \gamma \mu a$ ：the influence of the preceding ${ }_{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \varphi$ causes $\hat{\psi}$ to be preferred to the more usual ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\prime \prime}$ ．
 deictic：the voice should pause before and after it．The laws and constitution of Athens are arraigned before Socrates：whence dato－ $\lambda$ 白 $\alpha a \iota$＇to kill＇，＇destroy＇，viz．by giving an adverse verdict．So in Legg．Ix． 857 A，where the metaphor is still kept up：$\pi \rho o \delta \delta \tau \eta$
 the parricide，as it were，of his country＇s laws．Sce Introduction pp．vii－viii．

тd oòv $\mu$ épos：＇as far as lies with you＇：so in 45 D above．In $\hat{\eta}$ ठокє $\hat{\imath} \sigma O L$ oìj $\tau \epsilon$ it is better to regard $\delta 0 \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma o \iota$ as parenthetical （＇think you＇）and understand $\epsilon \sigma \tau i \nu$ with oíbv $\tau \epsilon$ than to understand
 see on 43 D above.
 but $\epsilon i v a \iota$ here $=$ 'exist' $)(\dot{\alpha} \nu a \tau \epsilon \tau \rho a ́ \phi \theta a \iota$ : it is not the copula.
16. $\delta$ ikal is here 'judgments', 'decisions' not 'lawsuits': this use is frequent in Homer, but rare in Attic. $\gamma \in \nu \delta \rho \in \nu a_{\iota}=\delta \iota \kappa a$ $\sigma \theta \in i \quad \sigma a l$ as in line 20.
17. äкvpot is opposed to ки́ptal: see line 21.
19. ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \boldsymbol{s} \tau \in$ kai $p \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \rho$ : the imagery of a trial is still kept up: see Introduction p. vii.
20. $\mathfrak{a} \pi \boldsymbol{m}_{0} \lambda \lambda \nu \mu$ évov: see note on line 13 above. Cron remarks that throughout all this passage there is an allusion to the custom of appointing ouvíropol or advocates to defend any law which it was proposed to repeal.
21. Öтt introduces the direct quotation as in Apol. 21 C
 ' $\varnothing \eta \sigma \theta a$ : infr. 50 C .
 wrong the laws) for' etc. Instead of $\dot{\eta} \delta i \kappa \epsilon t$ Heindorf requires $\dot{\alpha} \delta \kappa \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ : the present of this verb is frequently used of an injury committed in the past because the injury is supposed to continue till it is atoned for. But Socrates speaks as one who has outlived the sense of injury: the imperfect $\dot{\eta} \delta i \kappa \epsilon t$ is thus in keeping with the spirit of his motto $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \in \dot{\prime} \phi \eta \mu i \not \subset \chi \rho \grave{\eta} \tau \varepsilon \lambda \epsilon \tau \tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$ (Phaed. 117 E ).
23. "kpıvєv: the Aorist, not the imperfect, in spite of $\dot{\eta} \delta i \kappa \epsilon \iota$.

## CHAPTER XII.

The Laws proceed to argue that Socrates is their child and slave, bound to render them all the obedience due to parents and masters, or rather more, because one's fatherland should be more to one than parents.
2. kai $\tau a v i \tau \alpha=$ ' this too', viz. the reservation that you were to question our decrees, and disobey them if they seemed to you wrong. The antecedent to $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ is implied in the words $\dot{\eta} \delta \dot{\delta} \kappa \epsilon \iota \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho-\epsilon \kappa \rho \iota \nu \epsilon \nu$ $(50 \mathrm{C})$. The suggestion of Keck to read rav̉ $\begin{gathered}\text { d for } \tau a \hat{\tau} \tau a \text { obscures the }\end{gathered}$ connection and leaves каi unexplained : the meaning of каi is fixed by the following line: $\eta \hat{\epsilon} \mu \mu \epsilon \dot{\nu} \epsilon \iota \nu-\delta \iota \kappa \alpha ́ S \eta$, i.e. ' or to abide by the
deeisions delivered by the State', sc. without any clause of reservation.
3. Taîs Sikals: $\delta i k a \ell=$ 'decisions', 'judgments', as in 50 B , line 16.
4. $a v ̉ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \theta a \nu \mu a ́\} o \mu \mu \epsilon \nu \lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta v \tau \omega \nu=$ 'should be surprised at their language': $\theta a v \mu a ́ j \epsilon \iota \nu$ is regularly followed by a genitive of the person: Goodwin, Gk. Gr. 222.
5. öть: see on 50 в. Infra in line $7 \mathrm{kal}={ }^{'}$ also '.
 periphrasis: Stallbaum refers to Phaed. 75D кaì èv raîs $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \iota \nu$

10. $\alpha \pi$ o $\lambda \lambda$ úval: see on 50 B , line 13 . $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau 0 \nu \mu \notin \nu$ corresponds 50 D to $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ in line 14: the second question thus becomes more vivid: for a similar case compare 48 A and 53 B . $\quad \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu=\gamma \in \nu \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ $\epsilon \in \pi o \imath \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$ 'called into existence': Aristotle has $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\omega} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ aủvú $\nu$ (sc. $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ oủ $\rho a \nu \grave{\partial} \nu)=\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ aútòv $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \delta{ }^{\nu} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ (De Cael. II. $283^{\text {b }}$ $3^{1}$ ). The idiom is extremely common in Plato.
 $\epsilon^{'} \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu$. Note $\lambda a \mu \beta \alpha \nu \omega$ in the sense of 'I take to wife': so
 remarks that the imperfect calls up the circumstances and provisions of the courtship (if there was any) and wedding: for the collocation of the imperfect and the aorist cf. infra 52 C oüt $\omega \sigma \phi o ́ \delta \rho a \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} s \dot{\eta} \rho o \hat{v}$

12. тoúrols $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ roîs vó $\mu$ ols: here and in line 17 Schanz follows Hirschig in bracketing toîs $\nu$ óuous ( $\nu \dot{o} \mu \mathrm{\mu} \boldsymbol{\iota}$ ) : but the addition of these words makes the Greek far more explicit and emphatic. тои́тoıs is deictic.
13. тoîs $\pi \epsilon \rho$ i $\tau$ ov̀s $\gamma$ á $\mu$ ovs: Cron remarks that Socrates is thinking chiefly of the laws which established the legal validity of marriage and as a consequence the legitimacy of the children. Some account of the laws relating to marriage is given in Becker's Charicles E. T. pp. 473-498.
14. EXovoıv is probably the participle: $\tau \iota$ points to this (Cron). For $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} v$. note on line io above.
${ }_{15}$. $\tau \rho \circ \phi \eta \eta^{v} \tau \epsilon$ кal $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon(a v$. Plato frequently uses this expression to denote the upbringing and education of a child: e.g. Rep. IV. $445 \mathrm{E} \tau \rho \circ \phi \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon \kappa \alpha i \pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon i \nprec \chi \rho \eta \sigma a ́ \mu \in \nu 0 s \hat{\eta} \delta \iota \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \circ \mu \epsilon \nu$. $\tau \rho \circ \phi^{\prime}$ is the wider term, including the general care of the body: in $\pi a \iota \delta \epsilon i a$ the care of the soul is the prominent idea.
16. ท̂ ou $\kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega}$ : $\eta$-the less authenticated reading-would $=$ Lat. An? $\tilde{\eta}$ ov̉ is simply Nonne?
 implied in $\tau \rho \circ \phi \eta^{\prime} \nu \tau \epsilon \kappa a l \pi a \iota \delta \epsilon i a \nu$ (line 14). The word $\pi a \rho a \gamma \gamma^{\epsilon} \lambda$ $\lambda_{0 \nu \tau \epsilon s}$ is not to be pressed: it is doubtful to what extent Athenian parents were compelled by law to educate their children: see Becker's Charicles E. T. p. 228.
18. $\mu$ оvбぃкท̂ kal $\gamma v \mu \nu \alpha \sigma \tau \iota k \hat{\eta}$ : the two branches of Greek edu-cation-the end being to produce a sound mind in a sound body:
 $\nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}, \dot{\eta} \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \not \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} \mu \circ \cup \sigma \iota \kappa \dot{\eta} . \quad$ The latter in its wider signification included $\gamma \rho \alpha ́ \mu \mu a \tau \alpha$ (reading, writing, and arithmetic), кıÓ́pıб८s (lyre-playing), and learning by heart passages of the poets, especially Homer. See Becker's Charicles E. T. 226-236.
50 E 19. кa入ิs. This only commits Socrates to the utility of $\mu$ ovock and $\gamma \nu \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ : whether $\mu о v \sigma \iota \kappa \eta$ and $\gamma v \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\prime}$ were rightly taught is quite another question. It is impossible to believe that Socrates approved of Athenian methods of teaching : for he never wearied of attacking the ignorance of his countrymen, and knowledge according to him could be taught. In the Protagoras ( 339 foll.) Plato makes him prove by an elaborate caricature of the popular way of expounding the poets that no true education comes from that quarter. Plato himself rejected the popular education both in its actual curriculum and still more in respect of its method: see Rep. VII. 52 I C foll.

єโढv: see on 47 B above.

20. |  |
| :---: |
| $\xi$ |
| $\epsilon$ |$\alpha_{\phi} \phi \eta \mathrm{s}: \bar{\epsilon} \xi$ - signifies that Socrates was no longer a child: so Ar. Nub. 1380 ढैvaí $\sigma \chi v \tau \epsilon, \sigma^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \theta \rho \in \psi$ a.






22. aủtós $\tau \in$ kal oi бol mpóyovol: Socrates is, so to speak, $\delta o \hat{\lambda} \lambda o s ~ \kappa \alpha \dot{\kappa} \delta \delta o u ́ \lambda \omega \nu$. With this form of expression compare Apol.

 on a level with ours?' (Church) : кai=atque, as in pariter atque. The kai after $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ is explanatory, as in 50 D , line 1 I .
 argument: you may not retaliate on your parent or your master :
how much less upon your country and her laws! Compare Apol.


 on the passage. Here, as usual, äpa expresses surprise: the presence of ápa in both clauses makes the antithesis more pointed, and increases the rhetorical effect: Cron compares Prot. $3^{2} 5$ B-C $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$


 of $\sigma o l$ between the preposition and its noun is noteworthy: it is the less remarkable, because $\sigma o \iota \tau \grave{\nu} \pi a \tau \epsilon \in \rho a$ is nearly equivalent to $\sigma o ̀ \nu$ $\pi a \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a$ : cf. Eur. Med. $324 \mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \gamma^{\prime} \nu \alpha{ }^{\prime} \tau \omega \nu$ : and the well-known "Lydia dic per omnes te deos oro" of Hor. Carm. I. 8. r.
26. oủk $\mathfrak{\epsilon \xi}$ ívov ท̂v: the imperfect implies that Socrates' father is dead. oúk goes closely with $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \boldsymbol{i} \boldsymbol{i} \sigma o v:$ beware of taking it as= nonne?

 is the apodosis, for Greek (like Latin) prefers the more direct and dogmatic mode of expression ( $\hat{\eta} \nu$, erat, rather than $\hat{\eta} \nu{ }^{\alpha \prime \nu} \nu$, esset): Goodwin MT. $97 \cdot$
 equality of rights, Socrates might retaliate: otherwise not. As oúk

 just as in $3 \mathrm{I}-33$ we have a positive clause with $\dot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ to explain the
 rather than ov́к $\bar{\epsilon} \xi$ loov. Perhaps he was anxious to avoid the accumulation of negatives.



 serve as passives to $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \kappa \tau \epsilon \dot{\imath} \nu \omega \delta \iota \dot{\kappa} \omega$ etc. : see on Apol. 17 A.
 Clouds 1409 foll. Phidippides beats his father Strepsiades, justifying himself in these words: кal $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \eta \eta_{\sigma} \rho \mu a l ~ \sigma \epsilon \tau о u \tau \ell \cdot \pi a \hat{\imath} \delta \dot{\alpha} \mu^{\prime}$


$\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu \quad \epsilon \dot{U} \nu \in \epsilon \hat{\nu}, \tau \grave{\partial} \tau u ́ \pi \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$; It should be noted that one of the charges falsely brought against Socrates was that he set sons against their parents: see Introduction to Apol. p. xxx.
 which Stallbaum vainly defends. The choice lies between $\bar{\epsilon} \xi$ i'oov
 both because it changes less, and because I dislike the cadence of the first: I think Plato, had he chosen to repeat $\dot{\epsilon} \xi$ t'oov, would have omitted $\sigma o \iota$. I have added a mark of interrogation after ë $\sigma \tau a \iota \sigma o \iota$ : see on line 32 .
 Note the emphatic $\sigma \dot{\epsilon})(\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i \hat{s}$ and in the next line $\sigma \dot{v})(\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s: ~ I ~$ follow Göbel and Kral in writing $\sigma \dot{\epsilon}$ against $\sigma \epsilon$ of the Mss.
 -as we should naturally expect after $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$, a vivid question is substituted: compare on 50 D line 10 . At the same time a better antithesis is provided for $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \nu \sigma \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \hat{i} S \dot{\alpha} \pi o \lambda \lambda \dot{\prime} v a \iota$, and the awkwardness of the two accusatives in кai $\sigma \grave{\epsilon} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s \kappa \tau \lambda$. is avoided. For кai- $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ see following note.
 no case of $\kappa \alpha i-\delta \epsilon$ in a dependent sentence. This example is instructive as to the origin of the combination $\kappa \alpha i-\delta \epsilon=$ 'and also': the $\kappa \alpha i$ goes with the intervening words (cf. Aesch. Prom. 972-973 $\chi^{\lambda} \iota \delta \omega \hat{\omega}$;
 $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega)$. The precise force of $\delta \epsilon$ in this place is difficult to explain. The editors say that it is used "ad augendam oppositionis gravitatem: pro simplici кai $\sigma \dot{v} \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{s}$ dictum est : кaì $\sigma \dot{v} \delta \grave{~} \dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s, u s u$ haud infrequenti'" (Stallbaum). For this 'not uncommon use' no parallels are quoted: and I prefer to regard it as the $\delta \epsilon$ found sometimes in interrogative sentences, e.g. Prot. $312 \mathrm{~A} \sigma \dot{v} \delta \hat{\epsilon}, \hat{\eta} \nu \delta^{\prime} \epsilon ่ \gamma \omega$, $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \theta \epsilon \omega \hat{\omega}$,

34. тav̂ta $\pi 0 เ \omega ̂ v ~ s c . ~ \grave{\eta} \mu \hat{a}$ : cf. 50 E line 24 and note on 44 D
 Socrates hábitually professed $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} s$ : see Apol. 30 A and 4 I E: $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ indeed was almost a technical term in Socrates' preaching: see Xen. Mem. I. 2. 3, 4 etc. Sarcasm is frequently brought out by adding a qualifying participial clause at the end of a

 ís фабı Mé̀ $\eta$ тоs каi "Apuzos. It should be noted that the manu-
scripts of Plato often fluctuate between $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \mu \mu \in \lambda 0 \cup \mu \mu \in \nu 0$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \delta$－ $\mu \epsilon \nu o s:$ here the Bodleian has $\epsilon \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \delta \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$ ．On the adverbial phrase $\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon l\left(\frac{q}{\text { see }}\right.$ supra note on $\dot{\omega} s \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s .46 \mathrm{D}$ ．

35．ぞ оข̋т由s $\epsilon \mathfrak{i}$ бoфós．The Bodleian has $\dot{\eta}$ without accent： other MSS read $\hat{\eta}$ ．$\eta^{\eta}$ is a far superior reading：for the Laws having first taken Socrates at his own estimate（ $\dot{o} \tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \in i(\underline{q} \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \eta, s$ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi(\mu \epsilon \lambda \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s)$ now proceed to take him at other people＇s．It is clear from Apol．i8 i that $\sigma o \phi \dot{s}$（like $\phi \rho o \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \eta \prime s$ ）was almost a nickname of Socrates．Here of course the word is used with bitter irony，as indeed it often was in Socrates＇time：cf．Meno 75 C $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \circ \phi \hat{\omega} \nu$－


36．$\lambda \epsilon \in \lambda \eta \eta_{\epsilon ́ v}^{v} \sigma \in$ öть $\kappa \tau \lambda$ ：it is implied that the new oopia（of which Socrates and the Sophists were thought to be the professors） tended to lessen the hold of the State upon the individual ：see Ar． Nubes $889-r i{ }^{2} 4$ ．
$\mu \eta \tau \rho o ́ s \tau \epsilon$ каl $\pi a \tau \rho o ́ s . ~ F o r ~ t h e ~ o r d e r ~ c o m p a r e ~ w i t h ~ C r o n ~ P r o t . ~$

 $\tau \epsilon \rho a$ ．For the sentiment Stallbaum compares Cic．De Off．I． 57 ＂Cari sunt parentes，cari liberi，propinqui，familiares：sed omnes omnium caritates patria una complexa est：pro qua quis bonus dubitet mortem oppetere，si ei sit profuturus？＂That one＇s country has the first claim on one，and one＇s family and friends only the second，was the recognised principle of both Greek and Roman civic life，during their most flourishing periods．In setting self－study above political life Socrates was unconsciously preaching a view whose logical issue amounted to the dissolution of the old life which it was his aim to restore．
 $\tau i \mu \mathrm{cos}$ is one of the loftiest epithets that can be applied to $\tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega}$－ $\pi \iota \nu a: \sigma \epsilon \mu \nu o ́ s$ is applied to $\tau \grave{\alpha} \theta \epsilon i \hat{a}$ as well ：ärcos almost exclusively to $\tau d \dot{d} \theta \hat{i} a$ ．Translate＇worthier and more august and more sacred＇．

38．év $\mu$ elígov $\mu$ oipa：an elevated and somewhat poetic ex－ 5 I B pression：Cron compares Hdt．II． 172 кal $̇ \nu$ o $\dot{u} \delta \epsilon \mu \iota \hat{\eta} \mu o i \rho \eta$ $\mu \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \in \tau \chi \chi \nu$ ．

39．àvӨрஸ́mols тoîs voûv ĖXovol：few and far between：see
 $\beta \rho a \chi^{u} \tau$ т．

41．kal $\eta \geqslant \pi \in \hat{\theta} \theta \epsilon \nu$ sc．$\delta \in \hat{i}$ ．For $\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$ used absolutely cf．Apol． $35 \mathrm{C} \delta \iota o ̈ \alpha \dot{\sigma} \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu \kappa \alpha i) \pi \epsilon \ell \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$ ，and supra 48 E $\pi \epsilon i ̂ \sigma a \iota \sigma \epsilon$ ．
 This is to explain $\in \dot{a} \nu \tau \iota \pi \rho \circ \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \eta \pi a \theta \in i ̂ \nu$ of line 42.
 apodosis is $\pi o \iota \eta \tau \epsilon_{0} \nu \nu$ raûra. Socrates had himself fought bravely for his country at Potidaea ( 432 b.c.), Delium ( 424 b.c.) and Amphipolis ( 422 B.C.): see on Apol. 28 E.
 give way (it may be slowly) before the enemy, rather than remain

 $\Delta \eta \lambda i o u \phi v \gamma \hat{\eta} \dot{a} \nu \epsilon \chi \omega ́ \rho \in \iota \tau \grave{\partial} \sigma \tau \rho a \tau o ́ \pi \epsilon \delta o \nu$. $\lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau a ́ \xi \iota \nu$ suggests the $\lambda_{\iota \pi}$ otakiov $\gamma_{i} a \phi \eta$. The whole clause is meant to elaborate
 $\pi o \imath \eta \tau \notin \circ \nu \tau a \hat{\tau} \tau a$.


 $\mu \epsilon \gamma i \sigma \tau a s \pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ aủraîs $\dot{\alpha} \mu \delta \theta \in \nu \gamma \hat{\gamma} \pi 0 \theta \in \nu \dot{\epsilon} \tau$ о८ $\mu \alpha ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$.
50. $\beta$ ıá $\xi \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$. $\beta \iota \alpha j \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ and $\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$ are often connected or opposed: cf. Gorg. 517 в $\pi \epsilon i \theta \circ \nu \tau \epsilon S \kappa a l \beta \iota a \zeta 6 \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \iota \epsilon \in \pi i \quad \tau \circ \hat{\imath} \tau 0$ :
 vaúк $\lambda \eta \rho о \nu$.

## CHAPTER XIII.

In this chapter the Laws insist that to remain in Athens is to have pledged oneself to obey them, for emigration is free to all.
2. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\eta}$ is of course predicative, like oú $\delta i k a \iota a$ in the next line.
 on 50 E .
 asmuch as we have given permission'. $\tau \hat{\psi} \beta$ oviouév $\nu \omega$ depends on $\epsilon \xi o v \sigma l a \nu$, and ' $A \theta \eta \nu a i \omega \nu$ is a partitive genitive after $\tau \hat{\varphi} \beta \circ v \lambda о \mu \epsilon \nu \varphi$. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta a ̀ \nu-\nu o ́ \mu o u s$ is also to be taken with $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi$ ovala $\pi \epsilon \pi o \iota \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu a \iota$ : the permission is $i p s o$ facto accorded as soon as the $\delta o \kappa \iota \mu a \sigma i a$ is past.
 belongs to $\pi \rho \circ a \gamma \rho \rho \in \dot{o} \rho \mu \in \nu$. The apparent awkwardness of the sen-
tence is due to the use of $\dot{\xi} \xi_{0}$ oviay without a following infinitive: but this use is not uncommon in Plato, e.g. Rep. ViII. 557 D where
 $\dot{\epsilon} \xi$ ovoia was perhaps one of the familiar watchwords of Athenian democracy: cf. Thuc. viI. 69 ن́то $\mu \iota \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega \nu-\tau \hat{\eta} s — \dot{a} \nu \in \pi \iota \tau a \dot{k} \tau 0 v \pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota \nu$ - ${ }^{2} \xi$ govalas.
 Athenian was enrolled in the $\lambda \eta \xi \iota a \rho \chi \iota \kappa \grave{\nu} \gamma \rho \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \epsilon \hat{\imath} 0 \nu$ or register of his deme, after the usual $\delta о к с \mu \alpha \sigma$ ia or examination. This particular examination was called $\delta о \kappa \iota \mu a \sigma i a ~ \epsilon i s ~ a ̈ \nu \delta \rho a s ~ t o ~ d i s t i n g u i s h ~$ it from the $\delta$ oкц $\mu a \sigma i a \iota$ which the various magistrates had to undergo before entering upon office. It marked the coming of age of the young Athenian citizen: but it was not till he was 20 that he took part in the public assembly and attained the full privileges of citizenship. From 18 to 20 he had to serve in the $\pi \epsilon \rho i \pi 0 \lambda o t$ or patrol which guarded the frontiers of Attica. Stallbaum compares



II. $\lambda a \beta \delta o v \tau a$, in spite of the preceding dative $\hat{\psi}$ : cf. Euthy-

 Choeph. $410 \pi \epsilon \in \pi a \lambda \tau a \iota ~ \delta ' ~ a u ̂ \tau \epsilon ́ ~ \mu o \iota ~ ф i ́ \lambda o \nu ~ к \epsilon ́ a \rho ~ \tau o ́ v \delta e ́ ~ к \lambda u ́ o v \sigma a \nu ~$ оіктоу.
12. kal oủסєls- $\beta$ oú $\eta$ ๆ $\alpha$ al: omitted by mistake in B.
14. atrotкiav: an Athenian colony: contrast $\mu \in \tau о к \in \hat{\imath} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ in 15.
 but the text is quite sound. $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \rho \in \sigma \sigma o \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$ is the protasis to
 why one might wish to emigrate: tr. 'if any of you wants to go to a colony, supposing we and the State should not satisfy him'.
 (as opposed to a particular or special) conditional sentence: Dem.
 $\nu \in \tau$ aı каl кєขóv: Goodwin MT. ıо8.
 for $\mu \epsilon \tau о \iota \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda о \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \in \lambda \theta \dot{\epsilon} \nu, \mu \epsilon \tau о \iota \kappa \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$ might have been substituted. See Goodwin MT. 24 .
 with us'.
21. $\gamma \in \nu \nu \eta$ rais: so $B$, rightly: inferior mSS have $\gamma \in \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \tau a<s$. " $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \eta$ тai sunt genitores: $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \hat{\eta}$ rai gentiles.-Legg. xi. 928 D $\delta \iota a-$ форai $\pi a \tau \notin \rho \omega \nu \quad \tau \epsilon \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a u ́ t \omega ̂ \nu ~ \pi a i ̂ \delta a s ~ \gamma i \gamma \nu o \nu \tau a l ~ к а i ~ \pi a i o ̂ \omega \nu ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~$
 toùs $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \in \nu \epsilon i{ }^{\prime}$ ". Wohlrab. Mss however do not always observe this rule.
22. трофєv̂ซı: Socrates, so to speak, would have paid no трофєía: Rep. VII 520 в.
 taken with $\dot{o} \mu 0 \lambda o \gamma \eta \dot{\eta} \alpha \mathrm{~s}$. For the present $\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ cf. 50 C $\hat{\eta}$ кai
 кย́val $\pi$ o $\lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \cup ́ \in \sigma \theta a \iota$. In each of these passages Madvig (Adv. Crit. I. 370 note 1) changes the present to the future infinitive, on the ground that $\dot{\delta} \mu_{0} \lambda \sigma \gamma \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \pi o \iota \epsilon \hat{\nu}=$ confiteor me facere, promitto me facturum $=\dot{o} \mu 0 \lambda o \gamma \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \pi \circ \iota \eta \dot{\eta} \epsilon \iota \nu$ (not $\pi o \iota \epsilon \hat{\nu})$. The truth is that o $\mu 0 \lambda 0 \gamma \epsilon i \nu \mathrm{~h}$ has two meanings, viz. 'to confess', and to 'bargain' or 'promise': and, since the word 'promise' itself implies futurity, it may even in this sense be followed by a present infinitive, although the future is preferred, when the notion of futurity is more prominent. Just so in English we can say 'I promise to do' as well as 'I promise that I will do'. The same distinction holds in my
 $\nu о \mu i \zeta \omega$, $\delta о \kappa \hat{\omega}$, єiкós $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota$ etc. with the present and future infinitive: although Madvig, Cobet, and the stricter school of critics generally insist that the notion of futurity must be expressed by the infinitive as well. See Madvig Adv. Crit. I. I 56 foll., Cobet Var. Lect. 97 foll., Rutherford's Babrius p. 13, and on the other hand Kühner Gr. Gr. iI. p. 163 ff.
 is to propose some course of action, without, at the same time, excluding an alternative: thís is still further brought out in $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$


 the asyndeton see on $\tau \grave{\alpha} \tau o t a \hat{v} \tau \alpha \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \tau 047 \mathrm{~A}$ above. I have printed a colon before $\pi \rho о \tau \iota \theta \in \nu \tau \omega \nu$ as in 49 в.

## CHAPTER XIV.

It is here argued that Socrates, if he were to abscond, would more than any other Athenian be guilty of a breach of bargain, because throughout, all his life, even during the trial as well as before, he had shewn that Athens was more to him than any other city.
I. $\Sigma$ ókparধs. So B: inferior mSS read $\hat{\omega} \Sigma \omega \dot{\kappa} \rho a \tau \epsilon s$. The 52 A effect of omitting $\hat{\omega}$ is to increase the impressiveness, since $\hat{\omega}$ $\Sigma \omega \dot{\kappa} \rho a \tau \epsilon s$ is the regular mode of address: in English we obtain the same effect by exactly the opposite means.

4. ẻv toîs $\mu a ́ \lambda ı \sigma \tau a$. See above on $\ell \in \nu$ toîs $\beta a \rho u ́ \tau a \tau a ~ 43$ C.
5. каӨámтоเvто. каӨ்́ттєбӨą (in Homer with acc., in Attic with gen.) is 'to fasten on', 'attack': Thuc. vi. 16. I $\dot{\alpha} \nu a ́ \gamma \kappa \eta \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$

9. тои́т $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$ refers forward to the clause introduced by ${ }^{\circ} \tau \iota$.
11. SLaфєрóvт由s: differently from, i.e. more than: so too $\delta \iota a-$ $\phi \epsilon \in \rho \varepsilon \iota \nu$. For the repetition of $\delta \iota a \phi \epsilon \rho \delta \rho^{\nu} \omega \omega s$ in the protasis cf. Apol.
 $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \iota a ̈ \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi{ }^{2} \lambda \omega \dot{\omega} \lambda \eta$.
 Olympicos, Nemeaeos, Isthmios, Pythios, ad quos spectandos ex universa Graecia homines confluebant' '. Stallbaum.
 is now followed by an unconditional statement of fact. After $\epsilon \xi \hat{\eta} \backslash \theta \epsilon S$ in inferior MSS and in the margin of B are found the words ठ̈т८ $\mu \grave{\eta} \ddot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \xi \xi$ єis l $\quad \sigma \theta \mu o ́ v$. The interpretation (for such it probably is) was already in the text used by Athenaeus: see v. 216 b

 we find any mention of such a journey, and at least one passage

 $\pi a \nu \epsilon \bar{\xi} \iota \epsilon \nu a \iota$. Diogenes Laertius seems to have found the story in Favorinus, but not in Plato: he also attributes to Aristotle (no doubt wrongly) a statement to the effect that Socrates visited Delphi


 polis : see on 5 I B above, and Apol. 28 e.
15. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \mathbf{\pi} \delta \eta \mu i a v$. Cron remarks that oú $\delta \epsilon \mu i a \nu$ is omitted after $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \delta \eta \mu i a v$ for the sake of euphony.
 Cf. Hdt. I. 30 , where Croesus says to Solon: $\pi \in p i \sigma^{\sigma}$ o $\lambda$ d́ros $\dot{\alpha} \pi \hat{\imath} \kappa \tau a \iota$

 gous to oiod $\sigma \epsilon \tau i s \in \tau$ the object of the infinitive $\epsilon i \delta \dot{\delta} \nu a l$ is made dependent on the word ( $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \imath \theta u \mu i a)$ upon which the infinitive itself

 $\pi 6 \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ oikij $\epsilon i \nu$. So in Latin quarum potiendi spe (Cic. de Fin. I. 6c).
 fect and aorist see on 50 D каi $\delta \iota^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \dot{\mu} \mu \beta a \nu \epsilon \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \eta \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a \quad \sigma o v$
 51 E $\dot{\mu} \mu 0 \lambda \sigma \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma a s$ 市 $\mu \hat{i} \nu \pi \epsilon i \theta \in \sigma \theta a l$ : see note in loc.
20. $\tau \alpha ́ \tau \epsilon$ á $\lambda \lambda \alpha$ каí= ' and in particular'. The $\tau \alpha ́ \tau \epsilon a ̈ \lambda \lambda \alpha$ goes grammatically with $\dot{\omega} \mu 0 \lambda \dot{\sigma} \gamma \epsilon \epsilon s$, not with $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (Cron) or with $\kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon v ́ o v ~ t o ~ b e ~ s u p p l i e d ~ f r o m ~ i t ~(S t a l l b a u n, ~ W o h l r a b, ~ G o ̈ b e l) ~: ~$ to beget children in the city was virtually to pledge oneself ( $\dot{\delta} \mu \mathrm{o} \lambda 0$ $\gamma \in i ̂ \nu)$ to obey its laws.
21. Ėть тoivuv. $\tau 0 i \nu v \nu=$ ' moreover', as often in Plato and the orators. Apol. 33 E.
22. $\phi v \gamma \eta \hat{\eta} \tau \mu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma a \sigma \theta a l=$ 'to propose the penalty of exile'. Cf.
 $\tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota \tau \epsilon$. In an $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu \quad \tau \iota \mu \eta \tau o ́ s$, like Socrates' trial, it was the duty of the accused, should he be found guilty, to propose a counter penalty to that demanded by the prosecutor. Socrates proposed a fine of 30 minae: see Apol. 38 в.


25. $\tau \in \theta v a ́ v a l: ~ s e e ~ o n ~ t e \theta \nu a ́ v a l ~ i n ~ 43 ~ C ~ a b o v e . ~$

 $\pi a \rho \delta \nu \tau a s$.
27. E่vтрє́тєt. 'Turn to' naturally passes into 'give heed to', 'regard': so advertere in Latin.
52 D 28. Sıaфөєipat: because the Laws are personified: see Introd. p. vii.
29. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \mathbf{\pi} \delta \iota \delta$ párkety is the regular word to denote the running away of a slave: see on 50 A above.
 in 51 E.

 $\lambda \sigma^{\gamma} \gamma \omega$ is bracketed by Göbel, after Hoenebeek : but the words serve to emphasize ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \varphi$ - ' with deeds, not with words'. It is implied that a verbal compact is less binding than one in which deeds take the place of words. The opposition of $\lambda$ dros and $\varepsilon^{\varepsilon} p$ pov is familiar from Thucydides. For $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$ see note on 47 в.
34. d $\lambda \lambda \lambda 0 \quad \tau \iota \eta=$ 'nonne': supra on 50 A . $\dot{\rho} \mu \rho \lambda 0 \gamma \hat{\omega} \mu \in \boldsymbol{\nu}$ is a deliberative conjunctive: like imperatival expressions generally, the deliberative conjunctive can be used in subordinate as well as in principal clauses: as here the full construction is $\ddot{d} \lambda \lambda_{0} \tau i \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu \hat{\eta}$
 $\lambda \alpha \gamma \omega \bar{\omega} \mu \nu$ i.e. 'unless perhaps we are to get off'. See Postgate in Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, Vol. III. Part I. pp. 50-55.
37. $\alpha \mathfrak{\alpha} v$ фaî $v$ : for the position of $\not \approx \nu$ compare Phaed. 87 a $\tau$

38. ทi $\mu$ âs av̉roús. aủzoús seems to emphasize $\dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{a} s$ : there is no reflexive meaning. Cron compares Phaed. 79 A $\ddot{d \lambda} \lambda_{o} \tau \iota \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$
 tures $\sigma a v \tau 0 \hat{v}$, comparing 54 C : at first sight there seems no occasion for the unusually emphatic mode of expression. I think the meaning is 'bargains made actually with us': bad as it always is to break a bargain, it is still worse when the party to it is one's




 ${ }_{15-16}$ and IV. 4. 15, and often in Plato e.g. Prot. $34^{2}$ A foll. and Rep. VIII. $544 \mathrm{C} \eta ँ \tau \epsilon \dot{u} \pi \grave{\partial} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon \in \pi a \iota \nu \circ v \mu \epsilon \nu \eta, \dot{\eta} \mathrm{~K} \rho \eta \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon$
 in Crete and Sparta was their implicit obedience to the law: they formed the best possible illustration of his principle-rd $\delta i$ ikatov is т̀̀ $\nu \dot{\partial} \mu \mu \boldsymbol{\nu}$ : see Introd. p. xiii. غ́ка́бтотє sc. quotiescumque de iis loqueris (Stallbaum).
 of a world beyond the pale of Hellenism, if we may trust Phaed.


 nothing to do with the preceding oüre.
 For the statement itself see note on $\epsilon \xi \bar{\xi} \hat{\lambda} \theta \epsilon s$ in $5^{2} \mathrm{~B}$ above
47. divátทpot are "quicumque carent vel membro aliquo et parte corporis vel certe eius usu". Fischer. For the dua- cf. àva-

 is placed for emphasis at the end of the sentence as $\epsilon i \kappa 6 \tau \omega s$ is so often in Demosthenes: just so in Symp. 195 B фéçuy фuyñ $\tau \grave{o}$

50. àvev vó $\mu \omega \nu$ goes closely with $\pi \delta \dot{\lambda}$ ts: ' a city without laws'. The other meaning which suggests itself-' who could like a state without liking her laws?'-cannot be got out of the Greek : ävev
 could like a state which had no laws : you like your state, therefore you like her laws. Schanz (after Hirschig) brackets $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o \nu$ ö $\begin{gathered}\text { 亿-ă } \\ \text { Lev }\end{gathered}$ $\nu \dot{\delta} \mu \omega \nu$ : but the clause contains a valuable and strictly relevant idea,

vîv $\delta \grave{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\eta}=$ 'but now forsooth'. oúk $\epsilon \mu \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \in \epsilon$ is better than oúk èmuevè̂s (so Schanz with the second hand in B): cf. $\pi \rho \dot{d} \tau \tau \epsilon$ ts and $\pi a \rho a \beta a i v e$ es in 52 D .
51. $\grave{\epsilon} \dot{d} \nu \quad \eta \mu \hat{\mu} \nu \gamma \epsilon \pi \in \epsilon \theta_{\eta}=$ 'yes, if you take our advice'. For
 see also $53 \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{D}$ and 54 B .


 often $=$ 'funny' 'amusing'. Symp. 189 в (loquitur Aristophanes)

 $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha$.

## CHAPTER XV.

The Laws now reply in detail to the arguments of Crito: see Chapters IIl-v and compare Introduction pp. viii-ix. Escape will bring danger on his friends, misery and disgrace upon himself, and to say the least will leave his children in no way better provided.
 on 44 A .
 $\dot{\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau i a}$ remains so till it is expiated. Cf. $\dot{\eta} \delta i \kappa \varepsilon \iota$ in 50 C , where see note. raû̃a in taû̃a mapaßás is not 'these duties' (Göbel), but 'these transgressions': a cognate accusative.
 of sound, and also perhaps because $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \delta \epsilon 0<$ is still felt to be an adjective.
5. кal av̉roi фéveเv $=$ ' et ipsi exulare': sc. as well as you : $\kappa a l ~ \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ i.q. ä $\tau \iota \mu o \iota \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \theta a \iota$ sc. by banishment. On $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$ see above, note on 44 B . The Laws here reply to Crito's pleading in 44 E and 45 E .
 єirtiv, and ${ }^{\kappa} \mu \beta \rho a \chi y$ all mean much the same: the first generally goes with adjectives, the second with oú $\delta \epsilon$ is or $\pi \hat{\alpha} s$; the third is found

7. $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu \mu \dot{\varepsilon} v$ : the second alternative comes infra in D $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \dot{\hat{\kappa}} \kappa$
 on $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau 0 \nu \mu \notin \nu$ in 50 D .
9. Ө $\eta$ 'ßa̧ॄ. For $\Theta \dot{\eta} \beta a s \delta \epsilon$ : $\zeta$ was in fact pronounced $d z$ : sce Gustav Meyer, Griechische Grammatik ${ }^{2}$ p. 219. So 'A $\theta \dot{\eta} \nu a \zeta \epsilon \theta u ́ \rho a \zeta ¢$
 Schanz, Göbel: Wohlrab however reads Meүápaí and Kral Mє$\gamma \alpha \rho \alpha \dot{\delta} \delta): \delta \epsilon$ is enclitic. The constitution of Thebes and Megara was oligarchical : hence єن̉vouoûvтal $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ á $\mu \phi o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho \alpha \iota$ is said (not without a touch of sarcasm) from Socrates' point of view.
 you approve of their constitution, you have violated your own, and may violate theirs next, now that you have ceased to believe that $\delta i x a t o \nu$ is $\nu \delta \mu \mu \mu \nu$. Toút $\omega \nu$ is masculine.
12. vimoß入é ${ }^{\prime}$ ovtai $\sigma \epsilon=$ 'will eye you askance'. So in Symp.

$\dot{v} \pi 0-$ is 'from under the eyebrows': i.e. with a scowling expression ( $\tau \alpha v \rho \eta \delta \dot{\delta} \nu \dot{v} \pi \circ \beta \lambda \epsilon \in \psi$ as Phaed, 117 B), or sometimes furtively, of the stolen glances of lovers: see L. and S. s. v.




 $\rho \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \circ \eta \dot{\eta} \tau o u s \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi$ ous than reasonable laws. $\nu \delta \mu \omega \nu$ and $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega}-$ $\pi \omega \nu$ are opposed. The indictment of Socrates is to be found in



 $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha, \sigma \chi \nu \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$.
20. tivas $\lambda o ́ \gamma o u s ;-\eta ์ ~ o v ̋ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$. More vivid than $\tau o u ̀ s ~ a u ́ r o u ̀ s ~$ $\lambda$ órous ov̈́ $\pi \epsilon \rho$. B has $\tilde{\eta}$ : so Cron and Göbel. Schanz and Wohlrab read $\tilde{\eta}$ with some MS authority. $\hat{\eta}=$ Latin -ne? $\ddot{\eta}=$ Latin an?: see on Apol. 26 в.

 Goodwin MT. p. 60. Hirschig reads divaфaveĩodal.

тò тov̂ $\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho \alpha ́ \tau o v s ~ \pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu \alpha=' S o c r a t e s ~ a n d ~ e v e r y t h i n g ~ a b o u t ~$ him'. So oi $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ "A $\nu u \tau 0 \nu=$ 'Anytus and those with him': Apol. 18 B. There is some contempt in the expression: cf. Hipp. Maior
 used in much the same way, only with still more contempt, e.g.
 Weariness and disgust are expressed by a similar phrase in the first

24. ol' $\epsilon \theta \theta a l \gamma \in{ }^{\prime} \eta^{\prime}$ : a way of answering one's own question: so infra 54 в.
25. átapeis: Socrates as an exile moving from city to city: cf.

 Laws are now replying to Crito's proposal in 45 C .

 saly and Macedonia were almost proverbial for licence and debauchery: see (for Thessaly) Xen. Mem. I. 2.24 Kpıiias- $\phi$ ví̀v єis
 and Theopompus ap．Athen．XII． 527 j $\omega \hat{\sigma} \iota \nu$ of $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ $\sigma \grave{v} \nu \tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ o j ~ \rho \chi \eta \sigma-$


 $\beta i o \nu \pi \alpha \rho a \sigma \chi \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma о \nu \tau a \iota$ кєкоб $\mu \eta \mu \notin \nu \nu \nu$.

 apparel of some kind，generally unusual，as for instance the dress of an actor．
 The $\delta \iota \phi \theta \epsilon \rho a$ was a shepherd＇s skin coat．

kal $\tau$ ò $\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu a \quad \mu \epsilon \tau a \lambda \lambda a ́ \xi a s:$ kal corresponds to $\tau \epsilon$ in $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \cup \eta \eta^{\nu} \tau \epsilon$ $\tau \nu \nu$（line 28）．The clause refers to personal disguises not connect－ ed with dress．B has катa入入ágas corrected to $\mu \epsilon \tau a \lambda \lambda \alpha \xi \not \xi a s$ in the margin．$\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu=$＇to change＇：катал入á $\sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu=(\mathrm{x})$＇to ex－ change＇（2）＇to reconcile＇．
 тoùs $\mu \epsilon \gamma i \sigma \tau o u s \pi a \rho a \beta a ́ s$.
 oủ．




36． $\boldsymbol{v} \pi \in \rho \chi$ о́ $\mu \in v=\frac{s}{}=$＇cringing to＇，＇fawning on＇．In this sense
 Indicative in good Attic：when＝＇go under＇，then like ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \chi \circ \mu a \iota$ and its compounds generally，it supplies the other parts from $\epsilon \hat{\mu} \mu$（ $\hat{\eta} \alpha$ ， $i \omega$ ，$\grave{\circ} \mu \mu \iota, i \theta \iota$ ，$i \notin \nu a \iota, i \omega \dot{\nu}$ ，fut．$\epsilon i \mu \tau)$ ．Cobet，Variae Lectiones pp．34， $30 \%$ ．
$\beta \iota \omega \sigma \in \iota$ ．＂Verbum $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$ habet $\dot{a} \tau \tau \iota \kappa \iota \sigma \tau l$ has formas $\zeta \hat{\omega}, \beta \iota \omega \dot{\sigma} o \mu a l$, $\dot{\epsilon} \beta i \omega \nu, \beta \epsilon \beta i \omega \kappa a, \beta \epsilon \beta i \omega \tau a i \quad \mu o t$ ．$\beta t \hat{\omega}$ et $\epsilon \beta l o v \nu$ nemo dicit，sed $\zeta \hat{\omega}$ et
 semel et iterum comparet．＂Cobet，Var．Lect．p．6ro．

37．$\delta o u \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \omega v$ is not otiose，as Stallbaum points out：for the $\delta o \hat{\lambda} \lambda o s$ is a degree below the $\kappa \delta \lambda \alpha \xi$ ．


 used in connection with the luxury of the north cf．Ar．Ran．83－

 thon had settled at the court of Archelaus king of Macedon. Schanz brackets and Kral rejects $\epsilon \nu \Theta_{\epsilon \tau \tau \sigma \lambda i a}$ : but there is rhetorical force in the double mention of Thessaly at the end of the two clauses: see on 53 D line 26 .
 explain the $\Theta_{\epsilon \tau \tau \alpha \lambda \omega \hat{\nu}} \varepsilon \dot{v} \omega \chi i a$.
54A 40. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\eta}$ : alluding to Crito's plea in 45 C-D. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \delta \gamma^{\prime}$ is like 'at enim' 'oh but', and introduces a counter-argument: see

 ai $\rho \eta \dot{\sigma} \in \sigma \theta \in \kappa \tau \lambda$. In accordance with this and other examples, I have printed a full stop after $\pi a \iota \delta e \dot{\sigma} \sigma \eta \mathrm{~s}$ : the other editors take the sentence as interrogative.
42. $\tau i \delta \varepsilon ́ ;=$ quid vero? Note the emphatic place of eis $\theta_{\epsilon \tau \tau \alpha-}$ $\lambda_{\text {iav: }}$ Thessaly had an evil name : see on 53 D .
 $\lambda a v e \epsilon \nu$ has ironical force: the word is ordinarily used of something good. So in Eur. Phoen. $1204-5 \mathrm{~K} \rho \hat{\epsilon} \omega \nu \delta^{\prime} \notin о \iota \kappa \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon \epsilon \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \nu v \mu \phi \epsilon \cup-$
 construed generally with gen. of the object from which the enjoyment is derived, except where that object is a neuter pronoun: inferior mss here read $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau \dot{\delta} \sigma o v$.

 бомац.
45. छvvóvtos. छuveival and छuvovoia are regularly used in Plato of the relation between teacher and pupil, e.g. Gorg. $5_{15}$ в
 the $\tau$ óкоs $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \kappa а \lambda \hat{\varphi}$ of Symp. 206 в.
46. $\grave{\pi} \pi \mu \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma о v \tau a l$ : see on 5 I A line 34 above. Schanz brackets
 tence is spoken from Socrates' point of view.
54 B 49. $\sigma 0$ of course goes with $\epsilon \pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \epsilon i \omega \nu$. For oit $\epsilon \sigma$ al $\gamma \epsilon \chi \rho \dot{\eta}$ in the next line see on 53 D .

## CHAPTER XVI.

The Laws conclude their appeal by asking Socrates to think of the future world as well as this : see Introd. pp. viii and xvi.
2. трофє̂̂бь: see 51 A. Meiser reads roîs бoîs $\gamma \in \nu \nu \eta r a i ̂ s ~ к a l ~$

3. $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ S ı k a i o u ~ a f t e r ~ \pi \lambda e l o \nu o s, ~ a s ~ a f t e r ~ o t h e r ~ c o m p a r a t i v e s ~$

 $\tau \alpha ́ \tau \tau \eta$. Cobet needlessly rejects $\pi \rho \sigma$ : see Wohlrab in Fleckeisen’s
 Sikacov above.
 more dogmatically here than in the Apology : see 40 C foll. Compare Introd. p. xvi.





 $\sigma \dot{v}$ éкє̂.
 סькано́тєроу : ои゙тє in line 6 corresponds to ov̋тє in line 8 . סiкацоע is
 Gorg. 507 в.



 $\pi 0 \iota$ are the $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau a l$, falsely so called : see Apol. 24 D-E. For the full significance of this sentence see Introduction pp. x-xi : and cf.

 laws, but the $\delta<\kappa a \sigma t a l$.
 two participles that follow. There is an allusion to 49 B -D.


 of $\sigma a v \tau \sigma \nu$ : oneself is the last person one should injure. Compare
 $\dot{\epsilon} \mu a u \tau \delta \nu \gamma \epsilon \bar{d} \delta \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \nu$. Socrates' philosophy was egoism: see
 up the argument of Chapters xi-xv.
16. of ė $\varepsilon v$ "AıSov vópot: Cron refers to Soph. Antig. 450 foll. oủ


54 D 19. $\mu \eta \sigma_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\pi} \epsilon(\sigma \eta$ : Goodwin MT. p. 181.

## CHAPTER XVII.

Socrates concludes by giving his verdict in favour of the laws and constitution of Athens. Introd. pp. xi and xvi-xvii.
 this unusually long mode of address: Cobet and Naber utterly spoil the passage by omitting K $\rho i \tau \omega \nu$ : Göbel omits éraîpє.
 Corybantes were priests of Cybele whose worship was attended with much clamour of dancing and music on the flute. Lambinus aptly compares Hor. Epist. I. I. 7 ' est mihi purgatam crebro qui personet
 far more impressive. Just so the demonstrative is repeated in aür $\eta$ $\dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \chi \grave{\eta} \tau o u ́ \tau \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \nu$, and in the last line of the chapter : $\pi \rho \alpha \dot{\tau} \tau$ -

 might have said much the same of his $\delta a c \mu b \nu \iota \nu \quad \sigma \eta \mu \in \hat{\imath} \rho \nu$ : compare
 of the Laws coincided with the voice of the divine sign: see Introd. p. xvi.
6. ő $\sigma \alpha \gamma \in \tau \alpha ̀$ v̂̂v 'juol Sokov̂vca. Socrates' diffidence is charac-

 all only my present opinion '). Compare Gorg. 527 A and Phaed. 85 C-D. For the syntax cf. 46 E $\delta \sigma \alpha \gamma \in \tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \dot{\pi} \pi \epsilon \alpha$.
 which the Apology concludes ( 42 A ) ä $\delta \eta \lambda o \nu \pi a \nu \tau i \pi \lambda \eta \nu \eta \pi \tau \hat{\varphi} \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega}$. The voice of the Laws seems to Socrates to be the voice of God: his divine sign would not allow him to escape. See Introd., p. xvi.

## APPENDIX．

## List of Deviations from the Bodlcian．

As the text of this edition is based upon Schanz＇s collation of the Bodleian，it may be convenient to note the most important deviations from this ms．When I differ from Schanz and the other editors，it will generally be found that I have kept more closely to the ms reading ：most of the cases in which I have departed from it are discussed in the notes．Whenever I have adopted a reading which may be traced to some member of the second family of mss， best represented by $\mathrm{T}=$ Bekker＇s t ，I have signified this by writing fam．sec．after the reading in question．

Readings of $B$ ．
43 A $\pi \rho \omega i$

43 B єن́o $\alpha \iota \mu \dot{\nu}(\sigma \alpha$
43 C $\pi \rho \omega l$
$\chi a \lambda \epsilon \pi \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa a l$ ßapeìa
（＂каi $\beta$ креіад punctis no－ tatum＂Sch．）

（＂$\nu$ verbi $\delta 0 \kappa \epsilon i ้ \nu$ punctis no－ tata in B．＂Sch．）
44 B ov̀ $\delta є \mu i a \quad \xi \nu \mu \phi о \rho \alpha ́$
$4+$ C $\sigma \omega ́ \zeta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$
$4+\mathrm{E}$ व̈入入o $\tau \iota \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o u ́ t o u s$
（corrected by second hand）
45 A $\phi \circ \beta \hat{\eta}$
45 E $\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a ́ \chi \theta a \iota$
（corrected by second hand）
$\dot{\omega}^{\omega} \epsilon i \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$
тò $\tau \epsilon \lambda$ єutaîon $\delta \dot{\eta}$ тou
46 A $\pi \in \pi \rho a ́ \chi \theta a t$
（corr．sec．manus）

$\nu v \nu \delta \grave{\eta}$
$47 \mathrm{~A} \quad \alpha \partial \sigma \sigma$

The present edition．

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \pi \rho \dot{\psi}
\end{aligned}
$$

> そúouaццóvıба
> $\pi \rho \dot{\psi}$
> $\chi a \lambda \epsilon \pi \grave{\eta} \nu$ (fam. sec.)
$\delta о к \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \mu_{0 \iota} \eta \eta_{\xi \in \iota \nu}$（fam．sec．）
oủ $\mu i a$ そ $\quad \nu \mu \phi o \rho a ́$（fam．sec．）
$\sigma \dot{\psi} \zeta \epsilon \epsilon$
á入入o $\tau \iota \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o u ́ t o l s ~$
$\phi \circ \beta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$
$\pi \epsilon \pi \rho a ̂ \chi \theta a \iota$
$\dot{\omega} \mathrm{s} \epsilon \mathrm{i} \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \mathrm{s}$（fam．sec．）

$\pi \in \pi \rho \bar{a} \chi \theta a \iota$

$\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \delta \grave{\eta}$
$\widetilde{\alpha} \nu \sigma \varepsilon$

Readings of B ．

| 47 B | ô $\eta \lambda$ ¢ $\delta \dot{\eta}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 引ो $\epsilon i$ <br> （corr．sec．manus） |
| 47 D | $\hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\eta}$ тoû ėvós |
|  | （corr．sec．manuc） |
|  | $\dot{\alpha} \kappa 0 \lambda$ ои才 $\dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \mu \in \nu$（？） |

47 ㅈ $\hat{\eta}$ oủx ；
（corr．sec．manus）
ทं $\phi a v \lambda\langle\tau \epsilon \rho 0 \nu$
48 A $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}{ }^{\circ} \tau \iota$
48 в $\delta \eta \lambda a \delta \dot{\eta}$

$48 \mathrm{E} \pi \epsilon i ̂ \sigma a l$ $\sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \hat{u} \tau a \pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \epsilon!\nu$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta$ äкоутоs
$49 \mathrm{~A} \tilde{\eta}$（saepius：corr．sec．ma－ nus）
$\dot{\omega} \mu о \lambda о \gamma \dot{\eta} \theta \eta ; \quad 8 \pi \epsilon \rho$ каі ä $\rho \tau \iota$ єं $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \tau 0^{*} \hat{\eta} \pi \tilde{a} \sigma \alpha \iota$

49 B ov่ $\delta \alpha \mu \hat{\omega} \mathrm{S} \hat{\alpha} \rho a$
50 A ${ }^{\circ}$ ỡ；
（corr．sec．manus）
50 B iбxú $\omega \sigma \iota \nu$
Tàs $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \theta$ eí $\sigma a s$
（corr．sec．manus）
$50 \mathrm{C} \dot{\eta}$ каì rav̂̃a
$\dot{\eta} \epsilon \mu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \varepsilon \iota \nu$
（corr．sec．manus）



$\epsilon \xi \in \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$
द́ád $\sigma \epsilon$

$\hat{\eta}$ oṽ；（corr．sec．manus）
51 D

53 A катаүє $\lambda a \sigma \tau$ ל́s $\tau \epsilon$
53 B $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aủ̃ $\omega \hat{\nu} \pi \dot{\partial} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega$
53 D ката入入ג̇̆as
（corr．in marg．sec．manus）
54 в ойтє ס̇бเผ́тє

The present edition．
$\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a \quad \delta \dot{\eta}$
ทท $\mathfrak{\eta}$（fam．sec．）


ที oủl；
خ̈ фаu入 $\quad$ тєрор
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ö $\tau \iota$
$\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda a$ ón
каi $\pi \rho б т \epsilon \rho о \nu$
$\pi \epsilon і \hat{\sigma} \alpha \mathfrak{l} \sigma \epsilon, \mathfrak{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta}$ äкоутоs $\tau \alpha \hat{i} \tau \alpha$ $\pi \rho \alpha \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \ell \nu$
\＃
$\dot{\omega} \mu 0 \lambda о \gamma \dot{\eta} \theta \eta$ ； $\bar{\eta} \pi \hat{a} \sigma \alpha \iota$
$\tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa o l \delta \epsilon$ ă $\nu \delta \rho \epsilon s$
oủ $\delta a \mu \hat{\omega}$ äpa
ท） 00 ；
ioxúovat»
 sec．）
$\hat{\eta}$ каl тav̂тa（fam．sec．）
$\eta{ }^{\eta} \epsilon \mu \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$
âp＇$\epsilon \xi{ }^{\prime}$＇$\sigma o v$

$\pi \rho \grave{s} \delta \bar{\epsilon} \tau \eta \grave{\eta}^{\nu} \pi a \tau \rho i \delta a$ ă $\rho a$
Ë $\sigma \tau a \iota$
ধ̇àv $\sigma$ è
ŋ̀ $\tau \grave{\text { ò }} \boldsymbol{\delta} \kappa \kappa \ldots$
$\eta$ กov；


 marg．manu satis vetusta add． b．＂Sch．
ката ${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \sigma \tau$ ós $\gamma \in$（fam．sec．）
$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu a \dot{\nu} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \delta \bar{\lambda} \epsilon \omega \nu$（fam．sec．）
$\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda \dot{\beta} \xi^{\prime} \alpha$（fam．sec．）
oưうè ö $\sigma t \omega 亍 \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu$（fam．sec．）
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arpos 70
àஸ́v 38
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áסıкยิ้ข 51，58， 62
a：peîv 54
aiox $\rho^{\circ} \dot{\nu} \nu$ defined 39
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$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta$ єíq 43
à $\lambda \eta \theta$ ڤ̂s 43
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ふ̀入入á ${ }_{4}{ }^{6}$
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\eta} 7^{8}$
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ä $\lambda \lambda \omega$ м $\pi$ oteîv 33
ä $\mu a$ as a prep． 39
Amphipolis 68
$a^{a} \nu$ w．fut．inf． 76

а̀ $\nu а \lambda a \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu+2$
à $\nu a ́ \pi \eta \rho \circ \iota 74$
à $\nu a \chi \omega \rho \in i ̂ \nu ~ 68$
à $\pi о \beta$ алєìv 33
аंтодıора́бкєє 6п， 73
$\dot{\alpha} \pi о \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \in \iota \nu{ }^{25}, 26,6_{5}$
алтокіа 69
ג்тока́црєєข 35
ג̇токтเขขúva؛ 52
a ano入av́elv 78
ão入入へúvaı vó $\mu$ ovs 6 r
${ }^{\alpha} \rho^{\prime}$ oủ or $\hat{\alpha} p \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \in$ oú $3^{2}$
¿̀pa expresses surprise $43,57,65$
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$\dot{\alpha} \rho \alpha \mu \eta$ or $\tilde{a} \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \mu \dot{\eta} 32$
＇A $\rho \chi \in \lambda$ aos 35
Asyndeton 45
d́таद̆ła 76
Athletes，food of ${ }_{4} 6$
ätoтоу versus ä́mороу 28
Attraction of antecedent 35
＂，，relative 60
áфıéval 53
aivd＇the subject＇ 30
aủtiкa 30
$\beta \iota a ́ \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota)(\pi \in i \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$ б $\delta 8$
ßเoùv 77

dá $^{\rho}$ introductory 26

$\gamma^{\text {édooton }} 74$
रevvâv i．q．$\gamma \in \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \pi o \iota \in i ̂ \nu ~ 63$


रi $\gamma \nu \in \sigma \theta a i \tau t \nu t 41$
Conj．where we should expect opt．${ }^{2} 3$
Conj．Deliberativus 73
Copula omitted 34， 40
Cosmopolitanism 74
סaथно́viov $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i ̂ o \nu$ So
$\delta \epsilon$ in interrogation 66
Death better than incurable dis－ ease 50
$\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ supplied from verbal in $-\tau$ éov 68
Stev 47
Despair of Athens 59
ס $\eta \lambda \alpha \delta \dot{\eta}$ adverbial $5_{2}$

Delos，mission to 24
ठ $\bar{\lambda} \lambda$ os used personally 30
$\delta \iota a \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a i \tau \iota \sigma \iota \nu,{ }_{\text {én }} \nu \tau \iota \sigma \iota \nu, \pi \rho o ́ s$ rivas 3 I
סıaфépelv 57
бьафєро́vт由s 7 I

סiкal＇decisions＇62， 63
סíкalov 36， 79
סiкauós єiцц 33
סıкацобúvך 46
Divinity of soul 5 r
ঠокєі̂ боь parenthetical 6r
סокєîv used absolutely 25
боксцабіа 69
סov̂入os $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu o ́ \mu \omega \nu{ }_{4}$
Duality of soul and body 49
Education in Athens 64
$\epsilon{ }^{l} 3 \mathrm{I}$
$\epsilon i$ үà $\omega$ wै $\phi \epsilon \lambda o \nu 31$
ย $\epsilon \in \nu 47$

єіцарие́̀ $\eta{ }^{2} 7$
єi $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \rho \chi о \mu a \iota 3^{8}$
єi $\sigma \eta \gamma \epsilon i \sigma \theta a l{ }_{51}$
єlँoodos 38
eita indignabundum 23
єiтє каи＇or if you like＇ $5^{8}$
$\epsilon \kappa$ of the agent 25
éx $\kappa a \lambda \epsilon i ̂ \nu 41$
$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \in \hat{\imath}\left(\tilde{\epsilon}_{\kappa \in \hat{i}} \sigma \epsilon\right)$ of future world 79

є̇кхєì 57
eneyov with aor，force 44
є́ $\mu \beta \rho a \chi$ и́ 75


Èv roîs 24

$\epsilon \nu \tau \rho \epsilon \pi \epsilon \sigma \theta a<{ }_{72}$

Ėขúrviov 27

̇ंधovaia 68
énaíєty 47
द̇ $\pi \iota \epsilon \kappa \hat{\omega} \hat{s} \pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha{ }^{2}{ }^{2} 3$
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon і \bar{\sigma} \theta a \iota ~ 66$
 67
$\epsilon \pi \pi เ \pi \epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon!\nu 42$
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau a ́ \tau \eta s$ and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau a \mu a \iota 46$

＇єрабтóv 47
́p $¢$

ËT८ Kaì עû̀ 28
єv̉ కท̂̀ 53
єท̉ $\pi \rho \alpha \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \iota \nu 47$
 Tal 22
єن้̉о䒑єîซ $\theta a l ~ 73$
$\epsilon \dot{v} \omega \chi \epsilon i ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota 77$
є́фıттацац 61
$\epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}$ w．past tense of Ind． 3 I
そうท 77
ら̆ףтクTוKós 21
$\eta=$ Latin an ？ $7^{6}$
$\eta$ ）superfluous 30
$\eta ;=$ Lat．－ne ？ 76
ทं；versus ${ }^{\prime \prime} ; 67$
ท̈ ov̉；versus $ฑ$ Ə ov̉； 64
ク̀ $\theta$ เкós $2 I$
$\hat{\eta} \nu$ rather than $\hat{\eta}^{\prime} \nu$ ä $\nu 65$
$\hat{\eta} \nu=$＇is ex hypothesi＇ 49
＇Нро́дıкоs 46
 עเба 23
$\theta a v \mu a ́ s \omega$ ö $\bar{\pi} \omega \mathrm{s} 22$
$\theta \in \lambda \omega$ versus $\dot{\epsilon} \theta \in \lambda \omega 33$
Өєтта入la 35
$\theta \epsilon \omega$ pia 7 I
Ө $\dot{\eta} \beta a \zeta \in 75$
$\theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega 25$
$\theta \rho \epsilon ́ \psi о \mu a l$ better than $\tau \rho a \phi \eta \dot{\sigma o \mu a \iota}$ 78

Immortality 79

Imperfect and aor．combined， 63， 72
Imperfect used pictorially， 77
iva w．past tense of Ind． 3 I
Inf．pres．after $\dot{\dot{\rho}} \mu_{0} \lambda 0 \gamma \hat{\omega}$ etc．

## 70



каi－$\delta \epsilon 66$
каі－каi－ $\begin{gathered}\text {－пкаi } \\ 4 \\ 6\end{gathered}$
каì ס̀े каl 48
 $\gamma \epsilon \iota{ }_{5}$
$\kappa \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega \pi i \xi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \dot{\omega} s 7^{2}$
катаүé入абто» 74
кати́ $\epsilon \epsilon \lambda \omega s{ }^{2} 8$
ката入入áббєє 77
K $\epsilon \beta \eta$ § 34

Knowledge as virtue 31
коเрท̂ $\sigma \kappa о \pi \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ 43$
кориßаут兀む̂̀тєs 80
ко́б $\mu$ os 76
K $\boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{i} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu} 2 \mathrm{I}$
$\lambda а \mu \beta a ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$＇take to wife＇$\sigma_{3}$
Lamprocles 36
Laws personified 61
$\lambda \epsilon \in \epsilon \epsilon \nu \tau \iota$ ）（ oúdè̀ $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \nu 44$
入єvкクे $\sigma \tau 0 \lambda \eta$ gymbolical of joy 27
$\lambda_{\eta \xi \iota а р \chi \iota к o ̀ \nu ~ \gamma р а \mu \mu а т є \hat{o n ~}} 69$

入óyos 40
$\lambda \nu \mu a i \nu \in \sigma \theta a t{ }_{51}^{1}$
$\lambda \omega \beta \hat{a} \sigma \theta a \iota 48,5$ I
$\mu a ̂ \lambda$ خov ס̂́ 39
Marriage laws 63
Mé $\gamma$ apdí 75
$\mu \epsilon \in$ without $\delta \epsilon \epsilon^{2} 5$
$\mu \grave{\varepsilon} \nu \delta \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta}^{2}$ 2， 5 I
$\mu$ è̀ oû̀v 22
$\mu \in \tau$ vé versus $\xi$ ̧́v 50,54
$\mu \epsilon \tau a \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu 7$
$\mu є \tau о к є i ̂ ̀ ~ 69$
$\mu \grave{\eta}$ ที 54
$\mu \grave{\eta}$ oủ 24
$\mu \dot{\eta}$ position of 49
$\mu \dot{\eta}$ w．3rd pers．Aor．Conj． 80
$\mu \eta$ w．Aor．Imp． 35
цךтрós $\tau \epsilon$ каl татрós 67
＇Mixed conditional sentence＇ 40
Mop $\mu \dot{\text { and }}$ and the like 4 I $\mu о \nu \sigma \iota \kappa \grave{\eta}$ каl $\gamma \nu \mu \nu \alpha \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \eta \sigma_{+}$

ขо $о$ оөєтккй 46
$\nu \subset \sigma \omega \hat{\omega} \epsilon s 49$
voûs 67
$\nu \hat{v} \nu \delta \epsilon \bar{I}$
$\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\eta}$ or $\nu v \nu \delta \dot{\eta} 44$
छ̌v́v versus $\mu \in \tau \alpha \dot{1} 50,54$
$\xi v \nu \epsilon i v a l$ and $\xi v \nu o v \sigma i a \tau^{8}$
oi ধ゙vסeка 26

oî̀ $\tau \epsilon$ öv каi סuvaтón 39
ö $\mu \mathrm{otos}$ ，how different from $\dot{o}$ aú－ tós 41
ö ооооя каі т то́тєроу 52
$\dot{\dot{o}} \mu 0 \lambda 0 \gamma \hat{\omega} \pi 0$ oifiv and the like 70
${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{y} \nu \tau \omega \mathrm{s} 43$
ö $\pi \epsilon \rho \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \omega 35$
òpâv éáv 56
b $\rho \theta \rho o s \beta a \theta$ ús 22

$8 \sigma \iota \nu$ defined 79
ठัтt $\partial \nu \tau u ́ \chi \omega \sigma \iota 37$
ö $\tau \iota$ in direct quotation 62
ö $\tau \iota$ versus ö $\tau \iota 51$
oủ w．inf． 27
ov $\mu \dot{\eta}$ w．Fut．Ind．or Aor．Conj． 29
oủ $\mu$ la 28
oủó ằ ȯtเov̂ข 59
oủסєis éरc̀v á $\mu a \rho \tau a ́ v \in \iota 60$

oú $\delta \epsilon \nu l \xi \dot{\nu} \nu \nu \varphi{ }^{2} 54$

ov̉ס́érepa adverbial 32
oûtos deictic 34
oivos contemptuous 33,54
ovitos＇that of yours＇ 42
$\pi \alpha ı \delta \in i a 37$
$\pi a \iota \delta \epsilon u \theta \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \mu a \iota$ versus $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon \cup \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu a \iota$ 78
$\pi a i \delta \omega \nu \mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \iota \alpha \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota \nu 57$
$\pi a \nu \tau \partial े s \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu 5$ ¢
таракрои́єєу 44
$\pi a \rho a \mu \in ́ \nu \in \iota \nu 55$
$\pi a \hat{v} \epsilon$ and $\pi a \hat{v} \sigma a \iota 55$
$\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$ used absolutely 55,67
тєрітолоь 69
т $\eta \nu i \kappa \alpha \mu \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha 22$
IIiттакоs 58
Play upon words 27,46
$\pi \lambda \epsilon i \omega$ adverbial 41
$\pi o \hat{\imath}=\epsilon i s \tau i{ }_{4} 8$
$\pi$ ก七єโิ้ $\tau \iota 44$
тоเєîข $\tau l$ тเข 66
тovクpós 50
Potidaea 68
$\pi \rho a \hat{\alpha} \mu \alpha=$ profession 45
трактє́o 21
$\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ versus moteî̀ 32
т $\rho \in \sigma \beta \epsilon$ ย́є $\frac{1 I}{}$
$\pi \rho i \nu \mathbf{w}$ ．past tense of Ind． 3 I
$\pi \rho o ́$ after comparatives 79
т $\rho \circ \delta \iota \delta \delta \dot{\nu} \alpha \iota 37$
$\pi \rho о \mu \eta \theta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota \mu \dot{\eta} 32$
Pronoun between prep，and its noun 65
т $\rho$ d̀s $\theta \epsilon \omega \hat{\nu} 44$
т ротı $\theta$ éval 70
$\pi \rho \dot{́}$ not $\pi \rho \omega t \quad 22$
$\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu \quad \mu \epsilon ́ v$ without following єiтa（ $\epsilon i \tau \alpha \delta \hat{\prime}$ ）42， 5 I， 75

Rel．sentence passing into a main clause 39
$\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu$ ós 67
ミıuиlas 34
Sucratic method 40
Zoúviov 25
бофós 67
бтє́роцац 29， 75
бvкофá $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ al 33
oud $\quad$ jopot to defend laws $\sigma_{2}$
$\sigma \phi a ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu 44$
$\sigma \chi \epsilon \delta \delta \nu \tau \iota 75$
$\sigma \varphi \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ versus $\sigma \omega \dot{\zeta} \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu 30$
$\sigma \hat{u} \mu a$ versus $\tau \grave{o} \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a 50$

тá $\tau \epsilon a ̈ \lambda \lambda \alpha \kappa \alpha{ }^{\prime} 72$
тaútóv тоьồтov better than тaủtó тоєо̂̂то etc． 53
$\tau \epsilon$ displaced 23
тєӨ $\downarrow$ ával 25
$\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \chi$ व́pı̀ 54
т тиіка and тךขька́ঠє 22
$\tau \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \in \dot{\epsilon} \alpha, 43,66$
$\tau i=\tau i{ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \quad 77$
тi $\delta 仑$ ； 78
$\tau i ́ \delta e ̀ ~ \delta \eta ́ ; ~ 58$
$\tau i \mu \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha 22$
$\tau \iota \mu \hat{a} \nu(\tau \iota \mu \hat{\alpha} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota) \phi \cup \gamma \hat{\eta} \tau_{2}$
ті́цоs 67
ris emphatic $5_{5}^{6}$
ris understood 59
Tis w．force of litotes 27

тò $\mu \in \tau \grave{a} \tau 0$ र̂to 60
$\tau \grave{̀} \sigma \dot{\partial} \nu \mu$ épos 37，6I

тoívuv＇moreover＇ 72
тoloûtos prospective 45
$\tau$ бкоз $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\varphi}\rceil 8$
Travels of Socrates 71
т $о 申$ и́ 37
т оофй тє каі таıбєía 63

тú $\eta$ ？ả $\gamma a \theta \hat{\eta} 26$
$\tau \varphi$ ö övt 43
viós 36
ن́такои́єเข 22
ป่тєіккєц 68
ข่ $\pi \epsilon ́ \rho \chi о \mu \alpha \iota 77$
ข่ $\pi \circ \beta$ ィє́ $\pi \epsilon \iota \nu 75$

v̇бтєраіа 26
ข̇ф $\eta \gamma \eta \tau \iota \kappa$ ós 2 I
Ф日iŋ 27
фi入ia，Socrates on 30



$\chi \omega$ ois adverbial 29
ఉึ $\delta a \iota \mu \boldsymbol{\prime} \nu \iota$ and the like 28
$\dot{\omega}$ onnitted with vocatives 71山's $=$ 'for' 37 is not $=$ 'although' 29山ंs $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta$ जिs 43

ẁs Ė $\gamma \dot{\omega}$ ot otuat 34

$\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ with a prep. in similes $.4^{1}$
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ See my Introduction to the Apology, pp. xxiv-xxv.
    ${ }^{2}$ Chapters xix-xxii.

[^1]:    1 See note in loc.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ In Mem. II. 6. 35 all that Socrates says is that if Critobulus believes that virtue in a man is $\nu \iota \kappa \hat{a} \nu$ roùs $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu \phi i \lambda o u s \in \hat{v}$
     friends. Mem. 1II. 9. 8 proves nothing either way. In Aris-
    
     каi как⿳⺈s) it seems to me that Socrates is only making use of a popular definition of $u ̋ \beta$ ps to illustrate his own.

[^3]:     $\tau \iota$ кal ä入入o $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i \nu \omega \nu \tau o \hat{v} \theta \epsilon i o v \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \chi \in \iota$ and compare Crito $47 \mathrm{E}-48 \mathrm{~A}$.

[^4]:    
    
     ó $\rho \hat{\nu} \nu \tau a s \tau \dot{a} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$ $\beta$ ov $\lambda \epsilon \dot{\prime} \mu a \tau \alpha$.

[^5]:    'The ship will arrive to morrow. A vision has told me that I shall live two days.'

[^6]:    "We can cordially recommend this series of text-books."-Church Review.
    "The notes elucidate every possible difficulty with scholarly brevity and clearness, and a perfect knowledge of the subject."-Saturday Review.
    "Accurate scholarship is obviously a characteristic of their productions, and the work of simplification and condensation appears to have been judiciously and skilfully performed."-Guardian.
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